JUN 9

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Part I **Number 1**

The Crisis of Criticism

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BS
540
.A35
34,209

By

THE EDITOR

1422

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1925

THE AFTERMATH SERIES.---Part I

Number 1.—"The Crisis of Criticism," by the Editor.

Number 2.—"The History of the Israelitish Priesthood," by Martin Kegel, Ph.D., Student Lecturer, Joachimstal Gymnasium, Templin; also late Inspector at the Theological Seminar, Wittenberg, Germany. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 3.—"The Religious Reformation of Ezra," by Martin Kegel, Lic.Thl., Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY LAMAR & BARTON

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
JUN 9 1965

NUMBER ONE.

The Crisis of Criticism.

By the Editor.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/crisisofcriticis0000vari

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

I.

THE CRISIS OF CRITICISM.

THE religious thought of to-day struggles between two extremes. First, the stationary mind of ignorance, inherited prejudice, and bigotry; and, secondly, the conceit of superior learning, pride of party, and the obsession of philosophical method. The peril which comes to religious thought from the first of these extremes is natural and of long standing. It is to be eliminated by the application of a more consistent rote of the common school and a baptism of common sense. The menace of the latter extreme, at least in its more obvious expression of destructive criticism, is, for the moment, fundamental and crucial. It must be met with the same weapons as are employed by those who sponsor its teachings.

During recent decades the advocates of the extreme school of religious thought have made complaint that the term "higher criticism" had been used in a sinister and opprobrious sense, holding that it is derivatively neutral and scientific. Whatever in the beginning may have been the balance between the "lower" or textual criticism of the Old and the New Testaments, which has never been of divisive influence, and the "higher" or historical criticism of the same, "higher criticism" is a term now tainted with a just charge of malfeasance and misdemeanor in the offices of religious thought. The pragmatists and radical innovators seek to camouflage their position by begging the historical question on "higher criticism"; but the facts have become too manifest for the plea to hold. The higher criticism has become destructive, and must go to judgment under this charge.

The situation as thus characterized must be faced by every teacher of religion—the preacher in the pulpit, the

college professor, the church editor, the instructor in the Sunday school, the leader of the young people's society, and even the father at the family altar. It is a war in which there is no release. *A crisis in the criticism of the Bible and its teachings has arrived.* Already is joined the issue as to whether radicalism shall win or shall be overthrown. Those who have closely watched the tendencies of religious thought during the last thirty years are in no doubt as to the final discomfiture of that type of criticism which can be described only as destructive; indeed, are in no doubt that even now it is limping toward defeat. But an age of onset is still to be endured. Moreover, the length and sharpness of the onset is to be determined by the alertness of the constituencies of conservative thought and the activities of constructive scholarship. The forces of destructivism have been a century in gathering. They are entrenched in discussional literature, and, although distressed by reason of their own impedimenta, cannot be scattered in a day. They have moved slowly from point to point on the map of Bible interpretation. Indications of culmination and breaking up have for some years been apparent in the Old World; but knowledge of the fact does not seem fully to have come to the would-be critics in our own country. The world war sounded taps through the camps of the critics in Germany, but it is still *reveille* with contingents in the schools and pulpits of America. Perhaps they are to be commiserated as well as blamed.

Yet Bible criticism is a serious and praiseworthy business. Indeed, it is justly esteemed and classified as a science. The inquiries in this field during the past century have resulted in a genuine illumination of Scripture history and teaching. It is not too much to say that the older traditional views of the Bible have been much changed by the conclusions of legitimate criticism. In fact, the most conservative students of Bible science, while holding with absolute confidence to the tenets of Bible inspiration, the

correctness of Bible history, and the eternal fixity of Bible doctrine, are yet waiting to determine the full statement of their revised views concerning the letter and relations of several parts of the canon. These may be fairly described as the unfinished tasks of criticism, to which all devout students and scholars must lend a ready assent. In the further course of this treatise, I shall have occasion to speak more particularly of those matters concerning which this judgment in abeyance is held. My present concern is to make it clear that there is a safe ground of thought and inquiry which has no part with either of the extremes cited at the outset of this discussion. It is not a middle ground; it is rather an independent way which leads with militant directness across each extreme, and has as little regard for the pretensions of the high priesthood of criticism as it has for the cant of the groundling zealots. The constructive critic does not need to shorten his line or evade even one of the issues raised by the chiefest of the pragmatists. However, as a matter of fact, the problems of Biblical science settle themselves within a few lines of simple and straightforward statement. Real scholarship and a degree of technique are desirable and even necessary when it comes to dealing with certain textual and historical intricacies; but, for the most part, the questions involved are such as balanced faith, quiet reasoning, and devout diligence may well hope to answer. Lack of language equipment and versatility in history has deterred many, even in the ranks of the ministry, from undertaking a courageous tilt with the critics, or even a personal attempt at settlement of these questions. Many in the consciousness of this lack have accepted the edict of the critics as a proven fact. Indeed, I gravely suspect that the vast majority of those who subscribe the creed of pragmatism are of this class. Such, beyond any doubt, are in the pulpit in distressing numbers, men who through sheer stupefaction, or in desperate hope of advantage, have accepted a

bondage which they had neither the intelligence nor the courage to resist. These are heavy charges, to be sure, but not heavier than the facts warrant. The output of so-called higher criticism in America to-day, this "new light" on the Bible, this dismantling of Moses, this search after "myths" in the "sources" of the Old Testament, this "accretion" and "tendency" theory concerning the story and doctrines of the New Testament, are a paroquet of the German arch-pragmatist (Gewaltkritiker), whose methods came out of the world war in scarcely safer feather than did those of his counterpart, the Prussian militarist.

The purpose of this brochure, and of the series of which it is the initial number, is to traverse, in the light of the above observation, the chief points in this critical structure, so as to show wherein the pretensions of the critics have failed, and wherein the claims of the Book have been maintained under test. There is springing up everywhere in Christendom, and notably in Germany, the principal source of destructivism, not only a protest against the "cheap victory" of higher criticism; but also there is preparing an ample literature which will successfully both contradict the radical conclusion of Bible science and be constructive of its real results. The editor has arranged to cover into this series contributions from men who are amongst the chief promoters of these defensive and constructive efforts. The present number is meant to be a general review and forecast, charting the field of criticism, particularly as it has been cumbered by the conclusions of the pragmatists, and indicating a method of clearance.

Previous to the beginning of the latter half of the last century, outside of a few continental and British schools, there was observable scarcely a symptom of the present disturbing movement in Biblical inquiry. Christian theology still battled with the bedraggled legatees of Deism, and had begun to sight the front of the new material and monistic evolution; but within the evangelical

Churches the traditional view of Bible history, authorship, and doctrine held undisputed sway. The traditional view, as then held, was about this, namely: The Old Testament consisted of a series of sacred books, whose dates ranged from about the fourteenth century B.C. to near the beginning of the fourth century B.C., a period fairly estimated at one thousand years. The student may visualize this period by comparing it with the time which falls in English history from the present back to the age of Alfred the Great. The unquestioned canon of the New Testament consisted, according to the traditional view, of the four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul, the two Epistles of Peter, the three Epistles of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and Jude, and the book of the Revelation, with the single exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews, allowed to the authorship of the men to whom early tradition assigned them.

With reference to the Old Testament, the Pentateuch, or first five books, with the exception of certain editorial *nexi*, occasional editorial notes (footnotes), and the biographical sketch of Moses at the end of Deuteronomy, were credited to Moses, as indeed the books themselves generally claim. As to the other historical books, those of Joshua and Samuel were credited to those leaders. As to the others, Judges, Ruth, the two Books of the Kings, the two Books of the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Job, their authorship was never a matter of spirited controversy. The Psalms were, in the main, attributed to David; the books of Canticles, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, to Solomon; while the Prophecies went, without reservation, to the men with whose names they had been associated from the remotest antiquity. This order of canonicity and authorship made natural and logical the traditional order of the development of Israelitish history, nationality, and religion. That order, succinctly stated, is as follows:

1. A brief cosmology, or record of creation, a scarcely

less brief history of the human race, including the multiplication of tongues and the migration of peoples, bringing the narrative, through Genesis, down to the emergence of a chosen family and its growth into a multiple of tribes, as set forth in the first sections of the book of Exodus, which tribes are then shown as rising to the estate of a nation in transit to the scene of permanent empire. Quite logically, the history of this transaction, the forty years of life in the wilderness, told in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, infolds the laws, civil and ecclesiastical, as also the institutes and ritual of national religion, which were meant to govern, stabilize, and spiritualize the people in their new dominions. The books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings in a logical way continue this history to, and even beyond, the point where the national religious consciousness begins to have a new expression in the messages of the prophets. The legal code established in the wilderness related naturally to the life of an agricultural people, since agriculture was to be the chief pursuit of the transplanted nation; it also involves the religious rites and ceremonies, and the government of the priestly orders, since the government was to be designedly a theocracy. To the traditional view, it therefore followed that the establishment of the Aaronic high priesthood by Moses, the setting apart of the Levites, and the construction, in harmony with these institutions, of the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, and the altars of sacrifice, were necessitated and the account thereof logically placed in the history.

2. The age and output of prophecy were to this traditional view the explication of these laws, the pointing out of their more spiritual significance, and the foreshadowing of their culmination, through national stress, disaster, and subsequent recovery, in a universal law and kingdom of righteousness, the law and kingdom of Messiah. Not only the letter of the history itself, but every process of reasoning, put the law and its concomitant institution, the

priesthood, prior to the age of prophecy. This had been the view of catholic Christianity, inherited from the beginning.

3. The period of decline in Israelitish faith and ethical conformity is marked by a significant event—namely, the religious reformation of Josiah, which was promoted through the discovery of the long-neglected, and sometime lost, law book of Moses. Tradition held, and has continued to hold, that this was none other than the embodied laws given by Moses to the tribes in the wilderness. With much reason, as I believe, some have held that the so-called code of Josiah was the identical copy of the law prepared and placed in the sides of the ark in the wilderness. In a general way, with both radical and conservative scholars, it has been identified with the book of Deuteronomy, though to a far different conclusion. The reformation of Josiah came almost at the height of the prophetic age; and it will be well for the student to keep this fact in mind, since it will have an important bearing on our analysis of the critical view of this reformation.

4. The return of the Jews from the exile in Babylon was marked by an event very similar to that which distinguished the reformation of Josiah, and which, in fact, is very closely connected with it in significance. On the settlement of the returned exiles in the homeland, Ezra, their leader, caused to be read to them the book of the law of Moses, and secured their solemn subscription to the same. The uniform belief of tradition has been that the law which Ezra caused to be read to the people at this time was also the body of the wilderness enactments and probably identical with the code of Josiah.

5. It is scarcely necessary here to speak at length of the traditional view regarding the writings of the prophets. It is enough to repeat what has already been set down—namely, that there had never been a serious question that

these writings belonged to the ages, and were due to the authorship, claimed by the writings themselves.

6. As regards the traditional view, the case of the New Testament also stood as I have already indicated. Of the four Gospels, two were held to have been written by immediate disciples of the Lord, one, at least, of whom was an eyewitness of the events of which he wrote; the others were the works of men who lived in the closest intimacy with the chiefest of the apostles. The book of Acts was accepted for the full face value of its claim as being a record made by one of the four evangelists, whose close relationship to the apostolic community was the ground of confidence in his narrative. The Epistles, with the exception of the letter to the Hebrews, were without challenge, both as to dates and authorship; and the same was true of the book of the Revelation. Thus held the traditional estimate of the New Testament up to scarcely more than a hundred years ago. It may be said to have been hardly more than disturbed even up to the present.

It is profitable to remark here that, while the critical distress which has come to the New Testament began later than that visited upon the Old Testament, the contest has been sharper, shorter, and even more spirited. We shall later go somewhat into details concerning the more important of the critical assaults on the New Testament; but for the present it is enough to say that the crest of the tide of New Testament criticism passed during the last years of the nineteenth century; that every radical conclusion of the critics has been abandoned or disproved, and that serious cavil against any important fact of the canonicity and authorship of the New Testament is a thing of the past. The persisting assault of destructivism against the New Testament is chiefly aimed at the cardinal facts of its history—namely, the Virgin birth of Jesus Christ, the miracles of the Gospels, the Resurrection of the Crucified, and the blood atonement in his death.

To cover in on their contention against the essential facts of New Testament history, desultory recourse is still had by the critics to such discounted data as that the early records of the gospel are mythical and traditional; and that the stories of the Virgin birth, the Galilean miracles, the Resurrection, and the Ascension are the results of an apostolic psychology of fondness and adoration which sought in these forms to picture forth the personality and spiritual mastery of a Galilean Teacher whose life service had not been able otherwise to perpetuate itself. It has even been ventured that these stories, which, it is alleged, grew through the first Christian century out of pious fancy, were told and retold until believed and finally got into the statements which now stand in the Gospels. The seriousness of this situation cannot be denied; and, though it is fixed somewhat apart from the main ground of technical Bible science, with the mooted questions of Old Testament history, *it constitutes the most real crisis of criticism.*

. . . . . .

With this outline statement of the traditional or orthodox view of Bible history, authorship, and religious institutions, we are now ready to present the conflicting conclusions of criticism, and determine how far these conclusions may be accepted as modifying traditional views, and to what extent they must be rejected as unsound and repugnant to the truth, as the truth appears in the books criticised and in the collateral testimony to their integrity and value.

1. Not only do the critics deny to Moses the authorship of the books of the Pentateuch, or any written part thereof, but, upon grounds which are rankly arbitrary, the writing of these books is set practically a thousand years later than the dates assigned them by tradition. Nor is this all; they are declared to be a composite of many fragmentary writings gathered from many sources and representing the sentiment and views of many ages, few of which sources

can in any intelligent way be located or accounted for. Those parts of the Pentateuchal composition—*i. e.*, the laws of Deuteronomy and the Levitical Covenant—which the critics locate in the later Jewish ages, chiefly in the time of the exile, are alleged to have been produced under conditions of subornation, connivance, priestly pride, and ambition. Specifically, the hypothesis, or charge (it is nothing less), is that the book of Deuteronomy, much as we now have it, was fabricated by the priest Hilkiah and confederate collaborators during the reign of Josiah, about A.D. 640, and palmed off on that pious and unsuspecting monarch as a genuine law book of Moses. In the same way, about one hundred years later, Ezra and other priests in Babylon forged the priestly code, as chiefly contained in the book of Leviticus, and, claiming it to be the book of the law of Moses, brought the people of Jerusalem to swear obedience and loyalty to it in the belief that they were renewing the lapsed covenant of their fathers. These laws, when given such shape as the priests desired, were finally infolded in a historical writing made up from divergent sources in the manner already indicated. Where these "sources" did not cover the lacunæ of the enveloping record, that record was interpolated and additional sections were shaped out of hand to harmonize with the forged laws and ceremonials. Thus the Pentateuch, from the first verse of Genesis to the last of Deuteronomy, was put together for a "purpose," and that purpose was the furtherance of a Levitical propaganda. The hand which thus wrought in the Pentateuch also composed the chapters of the book of Joshua, in which it was seen to that the original matter was sufficiently "interpolated" to support the Levitical pretensions.

This hypothesis of a complex writing in the first six books of the Old Testament (the so-called Hexateuch) has given rise to the use of the cabals, J, E, JE, D, P, upon the explanation of which we need not tarry at great length.

It is enough to say that J and E (the Jahvistic and Elohistic "sources") of the Pentateuch, the oldest parts of that work, are not earlier in origin than the time of the writing prophets of Israel, perhaps, originated in Babylon as the envelope of the "forged decretals" of the priests. D is, of course, recognized as the sign for Deuteronomy, the pseudepigraphical book of the age of Josiah, while P covers the priestly innovations of the exilic and post-exilic age, projected backward in the name and in the mouth of Moses. A few fragments in the books of Samuel and the so-called "core" of the book of the Judges are critically allowed to be older than even these "source" writings of the Pentateuch. In this way, they have been given a special classification. We shall consider this later.

The blunt conclusions of the critical hypothesis follow as a matter of course. Moses did not institute the Aaronic priesthood, nor any other sacerdotal order, in the wilderness; he did not there plan or construct the tabernacle or the ark of the covenant; the tables of the decalogue were not prepared by him, and therefore the consistent claim made throughout the Old Testament for the Mosaic origin of these is a pious fabrication, and must be justified by the Christian student on the basis of such casuistry as he can consistently, or inconsistently, invoke.

2. Logically also, this hypothesis puts the prophetical writings, for the most part, earlier than the writing of the law; and this the critics confidently contend was the order. In fact, it was the prophets who mainly created the "sources" from which the historical "envelope" of the law was drawn; that is, this is the guess of most of the stalwarts. But the priestly interpolators are held to have written into the prophets such glosses and emendations as were necessary to make them support anachronistic Levitical ideals. Indeed, it is by means of the "interpolators" and "redactors" that the critics are able to prove any

needed contradiction of the Scriptures. They start out with a preconceived scheme of Jewish history, prophecy, and law, and whatever stands in the way of this scheme is pronounced "gloss," "interpolation," or "partisan writing." And it may be safely said that the only justification is that they do contradict the critical hypothesis.

The elaborate history of the Davidic and Solomonic eras, which carries accounts of the preparation for, and the building of, the temple at Jerusalem, with its gorgeous ritual and amazing wealth of ceremonies, has been a puzzle and distress to the higher criticism; but the difficulty has been met in a characteristic way—*the history, in its main points, is declared to be a fiction.*

The clear recognition given in the history of the first temple to the office of the Aaronic priesthood, the large sphere assigned therein to the Levites (See 1 Kings iv. 4; viii. 6; 2 Chron. vii. 6), and the obtruding consciousness that the first temple was the pattern of things in the wilderness, constitute a crisis which is destined to contribute immensely to a final undoing of the higher critical construction of Israelitish history. For, as the case now stands, this criticism denies that the Aaronic priesthood was certainly known in Israel until after the exile. In consequence of this contention, the reference to Hilkiah as high priest in 2 Kings xxii. 8 is declared to be an interpolation. Equally is it contended that previous to the return from the exile descendants of Levi had no certain recognition as a priestly order, the word "Levite" previous to that time being only the common title of any Israelite who chose to take up the office of religion. The high place priest of the time of Josiah was of this class. The racial Levite as the exclusive priest in Israel did not fully come in until the reformation of Ezra. This showing is necessary to support the higher critical contention regarding the history of the Israelitish priesthood. It is upon specious claims such as this that the system rests throughout. An early num-

ber of this series will deal with the problem of the Israelitish priesthood from the traditional standpoint.

3. We have necessarily anticipated some of the important details which belong to the critical view of the age of Josiah, whose monumental event, the finding of the law book of Moses, is one of the determinative points in Jewish history. The traditional view of this event is contradicted by the higher criticism. The law book which Hilkiah claimed to have found in the temple, at a time near the end of the Jewish monarchy, was not a genuine law book of Moses, but a body of new and largely before undreamed of canons and statutes, put together by Hilkiah and other priests with a view to concentrating worship in Jerusalem and improving the condition, material and social, of the high place priests scattered throughout the shrunken kingdom of Judah, by gathering them into a community about the temple and putting the whole cultic ritual into their hands. As before noted, it is generally allowed by both radical and conservative scholars that the volume discovered by Hilkiah was the Book of Deuteronomy.[1] Some radical critics are disposed to hold that the actual composition of the book antedated by a brief space the age of Josiah; but it was still a scheme of the priests who waited their time. The method by which these critical conclusions are reached is the Procrustean preconceived scheme of Israelitish history—prophecy before the law.

4. The significance of the reëstablishment of Israelitish worship in Jerusalem under Ezra has been recognized by advocates of both the conservative and radical schools. The student of Bible history should carefully study this significance. A voluminous law book is found in the hands of Ezra. At great length, it was read and expounded to the people. The unequivocal claim was then and there made

[1]Vatke denies that the code of Josiah was in any way identified with Deuteronomy, and holds that the Josiah code contained ancient legislation.

by Ezra and his coadjutor, Nehemiah, as also by others, that this was a genuine law book of Moses. The people, many of whom must have had previous knowledge of its history, accepted it without question. Was it indeed an age-attested and well-known composition of the time of Moses? Conservative scholarship has generally had no difficulty in so affirming. Indeed, as we have seen, it is most frequently identified with the book discovered by the priest Hilkiah, or is held to have included that code in its content. The higher criticism flatly contradicts this view. The law book brought by Ezra from Babylon had been composed by the priests of the exile, and accounts for the Aaronic priesthood, the plan of the tabernacle, the antedating ark of the covenant, and especially the system of Jewish feasts and the elaborate sacramental ritual of the Levites. These had had no tangible existence before; indeed, were only conjured up fancies, meant to support the claims and administration of a coming hierarchy, in which the high priest should be an overlord and the lesser priestly orders a generation of princes.

5. We have already summarized the radical criticism of the New Testament. The attacks, as we saw, have been comparatively short, and the victory decisive for conservative scholarship. The main diversion against the conservative view dates back to the rise of the Tübingen school, led by Ferdinand Christian Baur, during the middle years of the last century. Its chief hypothesis was the *tendency* theory of composition, which described the alleged controversy between the Petrine and Pauline parties in the early Church. The Epistle to the Romans, the letters to the Corinthians, and the letter to the Galatians are set over against the first Epistle of Peter and that of James as a sample, a concretion, in fact, of this controversial tendency. This controversy is alleged to have persisted far beyond apostolic times and accounts for the authorship of several of the Pauline epistles and the second Epistle of

Peter, which were declared to have been written by Paulinists and Petrists sometime after the beginning of the second Christian century. On controversial grounds, the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Revelation were also pushed into the second century and their apostolic authorship denied.

The New Testament criticism arose from the ashes of eighteenth-century Deism. Contrary to a popular notion of the present day, Deism was not an agnostic negation, but was a well-developed, though never systematically digested, theology. It was Arianism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism in their last statement. The main tenet of Deism was the unity of the Godhead in one person, excluding the possibility of the other two persons of the Trinity. This Godhead was, as the Deist was wont to explain, the God of nature and of law. He was ethical, humane, and merciful, but was made known to men in no special revelation; least of all did he express himself through any form of overt miracle. These assumptions necessitated a logical sequence which dealt destructively with the records of the New Testament in the effort to efface from the Gospels the portrait of the divine-human Christ. It was a repetition of the course of the early Church heresies, as the Docetic, the Sabellian, and the Apollinarian. It was the logic of Mephistopheles in his speech to Faust: "I cannot enter until the *Logos* be read out of John." The history of Deism exhibits a long list of names, every one of which suggests more or less this destructive logic. Hume, Hobbes, Gibbon, Locke, Bolingbroke, Mandeville, Voltaire, Rousseau, and others on the continent and in England are in this list. They did not deny a historical canon of Scripture. They did not wholly reject the claims of the New Testament. They sought to divest these Scriptures of all miraculous aspect and content and to reduce the gospel narrative to the basis of a natural evolution. They anticipated in their theories the monistic methods of Herbert Spencer and Ernst Haeckel. Strauss, in his "*Leben*

Jesu," concreted the system in admitting the truth of the historical Christ and the historical record; but he explained the claim of Jesus to be a divine Person, the Son of God, as the result of a totality of myths which grew up in the early Church and were incorporated in the Gospels.

The emergence of a new form of monism in the nineteenth-century schools of evolution supplied the impulse which revived so much of Deism as sought to be a system of Bible criticism and reconstructive theology. The Tübingen school of New Testament criticism became its typical expression. Ferdinand Christian Baur and those who wrought with and after him followed the methods of the Deistical schools in this, that, while they accepted the historical character of the New Testament writings, they brought to bear upon them so strong a subjective criticism as utterly to disjoint and disrupt their canonical authority. Thus it is that Tübingenism came, like Wellhausenism as related to the Old Testament, to be synonymous with a discounted New Testament.

But the past quarter of a century has put a new aspect upon the situation. Comparatively few students, even of the more constant and inquisitive class, realize how completely the pendulum has swung back toward the traditional view. At the end of the struggle the books of the New Testament, from Matthew to Revelation, are fully accounted for.

But I may take up in detail a few of the more salient issues of this historical struggle. Baur appears to have been the first of the critics to question seriously the traditional authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel. Objection was made by him and his school to this Gospel on the score: (1) That the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, with its *Logos* doctrine, showed it to be an echo of the Alexandrian school and the age of Gnosticism, which would necessarily place its origin no earlier than the second century; (2) that it contains matter not in the other Gospels and

therefore must have come from a later tradition in the Church; (3) that it contains elements of mysticism in the ejaculatory sections of its first chapters, which indicate a later time of origin; (4) that it shows signs of having been added to or edited particularly in its closing chapter.

All these objections have been fully met in recent rebuttals. One point in history has come to be accepted by all schools as conclusive. Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp, who was himself a disciple of St. John, affirms that Polycarp repeatedly related to him sayings of St. John which he himself had heard at the mouth of the beloved disciple and also had told him that St. John was the author of the Gospel which bears his name. This is as certain as any fact in history can possibly be.

As to the objection that the *Logos* prologue of the Fourth Gospel should be of neo-Platonic or Gnostic origin, it has been conclusively shown by competent authorities that the use of *logos*, which is only the Greek term for *word*, is of Hebrew origin, and St. John used it in this sense, the occasion being its philosophical use in such Greek communities as Ephesus, where the Fourth Gospel was written.

The alleged mystical passages of the Fourth Gospel are but the natural utterances of a saint whose venerable years and ripe religious experience burst out in the emotional paragraphs of the third chapter of this Gospel. The peculiarities of the closing chapter are explicable on the basis of the evident purpose of the apostle to keep his own personality in the background in those connections in which in the discourses of the Master he was distinguished from the other ten disciples.

The case of the two Pastoral Epistles, Second Timothy and Titus, is this: The Tübingen critics have declared that the character of Church administration and orders described therein are not such as belong to the age to which tradition ascribes the writings and that therefore they must have been written at a much later date and so not by Paul.

This pragmatism has come of two facts: First, the disposition of the critics to read into these epistles mistaken interpretations of what they really show concerning Church orders and administration; and, secondly, a failure to appreciate the historical relations involved. These epistles, it is now shown, were written after St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome and possibly ten years after the writing of the Epistle to the Corinthians, with which they are compared by the critics. The time was sufficient to allow for marked changes in Church administrations. Recent inquiries also show that the two pastorals adequately typed the state of ministerial office in the last years of St. Paul's life. Such researches as those conducted by Sir William Ramsay in the life and antiquities of the cities in which St. Paul labored have given support to these conclusions. Besides, these and the other New Testament writings could have come from only apostolic hands. The samples of composition which we have from the fathers of the Church in the age immediately following the age of the apostles do not disclose a personality with the gifts or ideals necessary to write even the least important of the New Testament books. The epistles of Barnabas, Clement, and others who were contemporaries of the apostles conclusively prove this. It is under this argument, in addition to its strong internal apostolic testimony, that the second Epistle of Peter stands. This is also true of the Apocalypse of St. John.

The fine-spun theorizings concerning an Ur-Mark as a basis for accounting for large parts of the two Gospels of Matthew and Luke as well as of a *logia* of St. Matthew are at best more curious than profitable. The authority of the three synoptical Gospels stands in the historical statement of Polycarp, already cited, which, were it needed, supports the authenticity of all. But the Gospels stand on their own testimony, which testimony has made its final appeal to the court of Christian scholarship.

A dozen years ago I heard Dr. J. Hope Moulton, then

one of the foremost Greek New Testament authorities of the world, say that, in his judgment, the remaining unsettled problems of New Testament science related only to the Fourth Gospel and to two or three other books, presumably two of the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul and the Second of Peter. Since that time conservative scholarship has silenced the guns of opposition to the Fourth Gospel and the Pastoral Epistles by an appeal to the letter of unquestioned history, and the case of Second Peter is now as safe as that of the letter of James, and no valid argument against the Jacobine authorship and date of that writing has ever been produced.

Radical criticism of the New Testament is thus practically a finished history; it likewise has been, so far as destructive results are concerned, a fruitless task. Probably never again will a serious effort be made to discount the canonicity or traditional date of any book of the New Testament. Questions of authorship, priority of writing, correction of texts and readings, as also the determination of relative doctrinal values, constitute a legitimate and not yet fully covered field; but the old issue of authenticity appears to be settled, at least so far as responsible scholarship is involved.

The above represented views do not wholly account for the adverse New Testament criticism which seeks to discredit the form and content of the chiefest of the doctrines of the gospel. Yet it may be affirmed safely that the assaults on the doctrine of the Virgin birth, the miracles of the Gospel, the blood atonement, and the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ make but small use of what, strictly speaking, may be classed as criticism; they are chiefly supported by assertion, insipient rationalism, and Saddusaic dullness of spiritual perception.

Thus it appears that what remains of critical Bible controversy appertains chiefly to the department of Old Testament science. We shall therefore give the remainder

of this brochure to the answer of conservative criticism to the conclusions of the Old Testament destructivists, along the lines indicated in preceding paragraphs.

We have seen that the higher criticism starts out with (a) a flat denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; and with (b) the counter assertion that it was written many centuries later, and in a spirit far different from that which is described as inspiring its traditional writing in the wilderness. What proof is advanced to support these positions?

In the first place, it is alleged that, especially in Genesis, and, to a degree, in all the Pentateuchal books, distinct word clusters, notably of the divine name, idiomatic differences and divergences of viewpoint occur in such order and relation as to make it clear that the books are made up from many "sources," are a work of many writers, pieced together, yet, as is admitted, in such way as to make a harmonious whole. The work of piecing together is credited to an editor or redactor, or it may be to collaborators who undertook the task. It will be pertinent to ask now and to discuss later the question, "Why may not Moses have been both author and redactor; or, certainly, why may he not have been author, and the redactor nearer his own age, than the critics suppose?" It is just here that a future stroke is to be delivered; for evidence accumulates that Moses not only could well have written the Pentateuch, but that it was written in his age.

The "source" theory of Pentateuchal composition was first, though faintly, suggested by Jean Astruc, a French physician of the eighteenth century, who, though celebrated as an authority in medical science, seems to have boasted no great critical ability. Astruc observed, what any reader of the English Bible may detect, that in given parts of Genesis, for instance, there appear distinct groups and variations of the divine name (*Elohim*, *Jehovah*, and *Jehovah Elohim*—God, Lord, and Lord God). This led to

the supposition that a number of older writings had been used in the composition. So far as my investigation goes, it did not occur to Astruc that this discovery militated against the claims of Mosaic authorship. Wilhelm Vatke, who was born in Germany in 1806, taking the discovery of Astruc as a starting point, became the pioneer of the so-called higher critical theory of Old Testament composition. He may be said to have been followed by Karl Heinrich Graf, born in 1815; but the great exponent of the theory is Julius Wellhausen, born in 1844, whose name has fairly been given to the whole higher critical system. Friedrich Delitzsch, born in 1850, has applied the higher critical-hypothesis in the most radical and destructive fashion. Other distinguished names are connected with the radical school, but these are the most familiar, and represent the personalities most directly responsible. Vatke, in his more radical processes, was influenced by the *a priori* philosophy of Hegel. On the genealogy of the succession which we have traced above, Dr. Martin Kegel has constructed this table of descent: "Hegel begat Vatke, Vatke begat Wellhausen, Wellhausen begat Delitzsch, and Delitzsch is the gravedigger of the critical theory of the development of Israelitish history."

But to return to the groupings and varieties of the divine name in Genesis. A comparison of the Massoretic Hebrew text with the Septuagint Greek largely destroys the value of Astruc's theory upon which Graf and Wellhausen so much relied. The Septuagint, which is much older than the Massoretic, very materially differs from the latter in the exhibits of these groupings. Wellhausen himself has called this "the sore spot" of his theory. It is indeed a "sore spot" which threatens to become "confluent."

Several years ago I called the attention of Bible students in this country to what I felt led to name the temperamental or incidental theory of explaining not a few of these appellative variations. These variations, in truth, are largely

modal, or expressive of attitudes of consciousness in the writer at the time of composition. I ask the reader to turn to Genesis iii. 1 ff. This is the account of the temptation of Eve. In the space of a few lines, which by no torture of the text or stretch of the imagination can be construed as belonging to any but a single source, the divine name is three times variously used, and in each case with apparent reason. The consciousness of the author determines the use. Moses opens (verse 1) with: "Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God [Jehovah Elohim, *Jehovah* being the covenant name of God] had made." The serpent accosts the woman (verse 1) with: "Yea, God [*Elohim*, the nature name of God] hath said." The woman replies (verse 3), using the same nature appellative: "God [Elohim] hath said." Taking up the narrative (verse 8), Moses continues with: "They heard the voice of the Lord God [Jehovah Elohim] walking in the garden." Now why should he have thus discriminated, putting one appellative in the mouths of the serpent and the woman, and himself, advisedly, using another? The reason is plain, as we have seen. Elohim is the name of God brought into Hebrew use by way of Pagan literature. Jehovah is the covenant name of Israel's God, and a word of exclusive Hebrew use. (See Exodus vi. 3.) Observe that the appellative *Elohim* (God) is used in the entire first chapter of Genesis, and goes into the second, in the account of creation. In the summing up of the creation, the planting of Eden, and the putting of man under a moral law, the author returns to the covenant name of Jehovah (chapter ii. 4 ff.). In the account of the first human home and of the first sacrifice, the name Jehovah is exclusively used (Gen. iv.). Many other groups might thus be illuminated if only we knew the consciousness which ruled with the author at the time of composition. Havernick, the celebrated Hebraist, has called attention to the fact that Moses uses the divine names with discrimination, and

always in conformity with the theological idea. He noted this fact as obtaining throughout the Pentateuch.

The details of the "source" theory are too many and too involved to admit of general consideration here. These sources as to their order of time, as critically classified, are: J, which is claimed to have originated in the kingdom of Judah, after the division of the kingdom of David and Solomon; E, from its supposed origin in the northern kingdom, otherwise described as the "Ephraimite source"; D, identified with Deuteronomy; and P, which, with its Elohistic accompaniment, forms the so-called *grundschrift*, or ground writing, of the Hexateuch. Besides these, H, the law of holiness, of uncertain origin, and other "fragments" are listed; but the summary made will serve our present use.

Since J and E, though the oldest of the sources, are held to have originated near the end of the Jewish monarchy, about 750 B.C., the critics find in the presence in the narrative of Babylonian words and ideas, as in Genesis i. and ii., a clinching evidence of their theories. But it is just here that the hypothesis is likely to meet one of its most certain defeats.

In a brief but masterly treatise, "Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, of Princeton University, says: "Now, if the Bible history be true, we shall expect to find Babylonian words in the earlier chapters of Genesis and Egyptian in the latter. . . . And, as a matter of fact, this is exactly what we find. The account of the creation and the flood are marked by Babylonian words and ideas. The record of Joseph is tinged with an Egyptian coloring. The language of Solomon's time has Indian, Assyrian, and probably Hittite words."

Continuing, Dr. Wilson says: "That the presence of Babylonian words in the first chapter of Genesis points to a time when Babylonian influence was predominant, no one will dispute; but the same influence is manifest in the

second chapter of Genesis and also in Daniel. This influence can easily be accounted for in all three instances on the supposition that the contents of Genesis i. and ii. were brought by Abraham from Babylon and that the book of Daniel was written at Babylon in the sixth century before Christ. While it might be accounted for in Genesis i. if it were composed in Babylon during or after the exile, how can it have influenced Genesis ii., if, as the critics assert, it were written somewhere between 800 and 750 B.C.? How also can we account for the Babylonian influence in Daniel if, as the same critics assure us, it were written in Palestine in 164 B.C.?"

How much more understandable, how much more truly scholarly and logical, as also how much more reverent, is this self-evident construction than the vague and unsupported hypotheses we have been reviewing! Traditional scholarship admits the presence in the Pentateuch of extensive sections of matter derived by its author from outside sources, the most ancient and reliable in reach, but always clarified, spiritualized, and monotheized, as in the cases of the creation and flood stories, evidently derived from some primitive record of the human race; but not necessarily, nor probably, from the Assyrian literature as contained in the tablets of Nineveh, but from a common original lying still further back. Traditional scholarship also allows the hand of a later editor on these books, as we have before indicated; but it can see only Mosaic authorship at the bottom, as the writings themselves claim, and which claim is made secure in accumulating proofs.

In addition to the very strong case made by Dr. Wilson, I emphasize a fact that the critics have most sedulously sought to keep in the background—namely, the knowledge cultivated in Egypt and Western Asia, during the age of Moses, of a general cuneiform literature and the legislative code of the Babylonians. From a valuable treatise, "Babylonia and Assyria," by Ross G. Murrison, M.A.,

B.D., of the University College, Toronto (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh), I make these extracts: "The extent of Babylon's influence on the nations has been revealed to us not by itself, but by its great rival, Egypt. In that land, at a place called Tel-el-Amarna, in 1887, some three hundred and twenty tablets or fragments were found, and have been deposited in museums, or are in the possession of private individuals. . . . These Tel-el-Amarna tablets are letters written by Egyptians to Egyptians, but all in the Babylonian character. . . . The fact that all these letters, even those by Egyptians to their king, are written in Babylonian, shows that Babylonian was at this time the official diplomatic language (of Egypt), and was studied and known by the people, as Latin was in the Middle Ages. One of these tablets is a mythological fragment punctuated with red points, evidently Egyptian, *which would seem to show that it had been used as a school copy for the instruction of Egyptian youth.*" This was in the age that immediately preceded that of Moses.

The lines italicized in the above quotation are of the greatest possible significance. Whatever composite compositional character is exhibited by the Pentateuch, and such character it possesses, is wholly explicable on the theory of its Mosaic authorship. Indeed, the issue raised by the critics against Moses relates to the strongest historical proof of his connection with the books which have been credited to him by tradition. In the millennium which fell between the crossing of the Red Sea and the return from the Babylonian exile Moses was the one Jew preëminently qualified to create the literature contained in the Pentateuch. The apparently chance expression in the Acts, "And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," has a tremendous relevancy. While Moses as a youth was being trained at the University of Heliopolis to become a Pharaoh the Egyptians were in possession of the literature and the laws of the Babylonians. It is not

at all unthinkable that copies of the older Gilgamish Epic, or other Babylonian nature books, and also digests of the Hammurabic Code, were in the hands of the teachers of the Egyptian school in which Moses, the Hebrew foster son of Pharaoh, received his education, and that he should have used them as textbooks. Certainly during his forty years of shepherd hermitage in Horeb he would have met this literature in its pristine state. The most orthodox critic will not deny that the author of the Pentateuch was familiar with the Babylonian cosmology and flood history, nor that he freed these from the meshes of absurdity and polytheistic grossness in which they were first cast. Nor will such critic desire to deny that the lawgiver of Israel was familiar with the Hammurabic code, a code representative at that time of the whole legal system of the nations of Western Asia.

The learning of the ancient Egyptians was genuine and could not have been without literature inclusions of so important a contemporary people as the Babylonians. Because the hieroglyphics contain no reference to Hammurabic or other common law, it is argued that the Egyptians would have none of it and that therefore Moses in his education could have known nothing of any such system. But it is to be noted that the hieroglyphs contain no showing of any system of Egyptian law. Is it, therefore, to be inferred that the Egyptians had no laws?

McCurdy, an accredited Assyriologist, supports the contention that the code of Hammurabi influenced Palestine and the West lands at the time it was operative in Babylon, the ages of Abraham and Moses. The International Encyclopedia (D. C. Gilman, H. T. Peck, and F. M. Colby, editors) has this statement: "This code of Hammurabi was probably followed in Syria as well as in Susiana and Babylonia, and it is therefore natural that many of the statutes should remind us of those which were embodied in the code of Israel." It is not only within lines of possibili-

ty, but of probability, that Abraham carried with him into Palestine some form or digest of the Hammurabic code or else the near originals of it. (See *in loc.*) Moses in that case could not well have escaped knowing its important elements. The authorities referred to above fully note the influence of the Hammurabic code on the West (Western Asia), also that the similarities between that and the Mosaic code are by some referred to a transmission through Abraham. But it is of the utmost importance to destructive criticism that all such showings as these be discounted. The critics are interested in making it appear that Moses was a rude, half-barbaric nomad, unfitted for the leadership and authorship credited to him in the Pentateuch. Upon such nail the whole system of radical criticism hangs.

How does criticism support its claim of the non-Mosaic and very late origin of the Pentateuch? Observe that the higher critics lay great stress on the alleged fact that in the strata of the Pentateuch there are seen three great eras of Israelitish religious and civic development, an evolution through a thousand years of the ideas embodied in those books, but they account for the writing of the literature and law forms of these "strata" in sudden factitious impulses, as in the cases of the law books of Josiah amd Ezra. In fact, it is specifically denied that any previous long-sustained national influence led up to the writing of the two law codes which constitute the backbone of Israelitish legislation. The chief contention of the school is thus destroyed. The code of Josiah (the book of Deuteronomy) is not the outgrowth of national consciousness, but the caveat of a priestly party. In like manner, "the book of the law" of Ezra (Leviticus, in the main) is the opportunist manifesto of a *junta* in Babylon. In all seriousness, I ask this question: If a few years, a decade or two, at most, in the disturbed and idolatrous times that preceded and ushered in the reign of Josiah could produce, out of

hand, the marvel of the book of Deuteronomy, could not the long reach of Moses's eighty years in the wilderness, forty of which were spent in meditations in Horeb and forty in leading and shaping the life of a nation, have better sufficed to do it? And if one man, or a dozen men, amid the slavery and dejection of the Babylonian exile could have produced the Levitical code, with its envelope of long passed Egyptian and wilderness history drawn to so marvelous a fit, could it not have been better done by the august hands, amid the scenes and at the time, to which tradition refers it?

If the critics be denied the assumed right to bring a preconceived theory of Israelitish history to the records of the Josian and Ezraic ages, and to mutilate those records, the claim of the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch falls to the ground.

Since I regard the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, within the lines of the exceptions noted, and the consequent refutation of the critical contentions regarding the law books of Josiah and Ezra, as the corner stone of conservative Bible science, I will close this part of the discussion with a strong statement from the pen of Dr. Wilson. He says: "There is no good reason for doubting that the Biblical narrative is derived from *written* sources based on *contemporaneous* documents. . . . Besides, writing had been in existence in Egypt already for two thousand years or more. . . . Abraham would naturally use the cuneiform system, since this is known to have existed in Western Asia long before the time of Hammurabi, and the Tel-el-Amarna letters show clearly that Hebrew was sometimes written in that script. But not only do we know that there was a script in which to write; we know, also, that the Hebrew language was used in Palestine before the time of Moses. A hundred common words embedded in the Amarna letters, and the names of places mentioned in them, are also largely Hebrew. . . . From these facts we

conclude that books may have been written in Hebrew at that early period." ("Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" pages 15, 16.)

The objection that the cultic history of the Israelites from Joshua to David does not support the claims of the detailed religious history of the Hebrews as found in the Pentateuch is without force, as it is without valid support. The meager accounts given in Joshua, Judges, and in the two books of Samuel concerning the tabernacle and the priestly administration thereof quite support so far as they go the story of the tabernacle as given in the Pentateuch. The high priesthood of Eli, of his predecessors and successors, up to the time of David supports both the spirit and the letter of the Aaronic office as described in the book of Leviticus. Eli is much nearer to Aaron than the Jews of the exile were to Eli. The argument is therefore in favor of the integrity of the Pentateuch. Account must always be taken of the fact that immediately on taking possession of the land of Canaan the Israelites became a scattered people, widely separated in their communities and families; that for many generations, even centuries, until they multiplied and filled the land, the tabernacle would be more of an official headquarters for such central government as existed among the tribes than as a place for daily and seasonal worship and gatherings, such as it had been in the camp in the wilderness. The common priesthood would thereby lose its prestige and uses during this period of accretion, and the building of the temple of Solomon, "after the plan of the tabernacle in the wilderness," would not be the creation of a national cult and the beginning of a priestly order, but rather the restoration and realization of this order as prophetically instituted by Moses in the wilderness.

Again, a futile attempt has been made to show that the tables of the law, claimed in the Pentateuch to have been given on Mount Sinai, and the Ark of the Covenant, in

which they reposed from the time of their giving, were derived by the Hebrews from a certain incantation box containing rudely carved and inscribed effigies of their deities which the Canaanitish nations bore before their armies in time of battle. With the Palestinian heathen this box was of inconsiderable size, so that it was carried on the chest of a man and by means of a strap about his neck. This, the resourceful critics opine, was the origin of the breastplate and Urim and Thummim of the Jewish high priest. I have nowhere in the flotsam and jetsam of criticism met a more fanciful theory. While editor of the *Methodist Review* I collected all the proof texts in the Old Testament which in the Hebrew are used by the critics to support this view. My belief is that each one separately refutes the critics and supports the integrity of the history of the ark.

The critical questions involving the prophecies from Isaiah to Malachi are largely subsidiary to the questions of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The difficulties, as in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, are chiefly of their critical construction in the light of an alleged Levitical history. Wellhausen and his school have undertaken to show that Ezekiel set in motion and sponsored the influences that led to the writing of the Levitical code in Babylon; but Dr. Martin Kegel will show in a future number of this series that the writings of Ezekiel had no direct or even traceable bearing on the Ezraic reformation. A special discussion of the prophecy of Jeremiah will also appear in future pages of this series.

The critical problem of Isaiah is a distinct one. Pragmatism has it that there are "two Isaiahs": the "deutero Isaiah," including chapters xl.-lxvi.; and, besides this, the other parts of the book are accounted for in fragmentary and longer sections added to the original work. The date of the *diaskeuast*, or reviser, credited with putting the work together, is placed as late as the second century before Christ.

For the present, reserving to future space a fuller discussion, it is only necessary to say that conservative interpretation takes the position that the prophecy of Isaiah exists in three sections of more or less marked characteristics, viz.: (1) chapters i.-xxxv.; (2) chapters xxxvi.-xxxix.; (3) chapters xl.-lxvi. These sections are all, however, ascribed to the general authorship of Isaiah. A few of the reasons for this are that Isaiah's name is attached to the whole collection; and that it claims to be "the vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz"; that there is marked unity throughout, even in its historical parts; that the prophecy was known to Jeremiah; that testimony is borne to its authenticity by Josephus; that the New Testament writers also support Isaianic authority, not only as to the parts admitted by the critics to be genuine, but also as to those which the critics class as "deutero."

Perhaps the chief gravamen of critical opposition to a preëxilic origin of much of Isaiah is the fact of its strong and direct prophecies concerning the exile, the return therefrom, and the personality and reign of Cyrus. The critics insist that these writings are history, not prophecy. But I ask if these vivid and distinct forecasts of events, then only two centuries in the future, are any more difficult of acceptance than are the Isaianic prophecies concerning the personality, death, and subsequent reign of Messiah, so vividly taken from the foreground of nearly a thousand years? Is it so much a matter of faith as of the logic of equal quantities?

The stylistic differences of the several parts of Isaiah are by no means irreconcilable. The prophet began his message in comparatively youthful years, and continued, through the reigns of several kings, to deliver his "burdens." Long lapses of time, changed conditions, and, most of all, the inspirational character of his final messages of promised deliverance from exile, will account for many differences in style. The differences between the earlier

and later writings of St. Paul are noticeable. The same is true of literary men in all ages who have lived and written over long tracts of years.

It is easy to find in the chapters of Isaiah accounted genuine by the critics passages fully as spirited and optimistic as is the general tenor of the so-called "deutero" sections. (Compare xxv. 8; xxvi. 1 ff.; xxxv. 1 ff.) In the alleged historical additions (lxiv. 10, 11) the language is the expression of a strongly visualized prophectic apprehension; and while it may not be possible fully to explain the peculiarity of form, the substance as a prophetic content is not difficult of acceptance.

The books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, as compositions, present no difficulties. Persian words especially appear in these books, which is accounted for in the fact that they were written during the Persian domination. But how, as our authority, Dr. Wilson, has asked, are we to account for such an exhibit of Persian words in Daniel, if, as the critics assert, it was written as late as 164 B.C., in Palestine, and nearly two hundred years after the close of Persian domination? Had Daniel been written at the late date assigned by the critics, there would necessarily appear an excess of Greek words in its foreign vocabulary; but Dr. Wilson is authority for the statement that there is in the book of Daniel not one demonstrably certain Greek word. The three or four *supposed* Greek names of musical instruments which appear in the text have come through the Aramaic or the Persian, and that in a commercial way. The critics have been consistently insistent in placing Jonah, Joel, Job, the Psalms (for the most part), Canticles, and, as we have already seen, the Priest Code of the Pentateuch in the Persian age. But Persian words are absent from these books, and especially so from the Priest Code, which the critics say was written by Ezra in Babylon during the Persian domination!

Commenting on the above facts, Dr. Wilson caustically

observes: "If the ceremonial law were written between 500 and 300 B.C., at a time when Persian power was supreme, how account for the entire absence of Persian words and customs from the priestly document (Priest Code)? Why should Ezra and his contemporaries have used so many Persian words in their other works and have utterly eschewed them in the lengthiest of their works? Not one Persian word, forsooth! How careful they must have been in this endeavor to camouflage their attempt to foist their works on Moses!"

Quite unfortunate are the critics in insisting in this connection on the well-known fact that following the Jewish exile Babylon became a seat of Jewish orthodoxy, resulting in the gathering together of a Babylonian Talmud. But the rabbis of that school for the "hundred years after the return from exile in Cyrus's day" and always thereafter never once suggested that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch or attributed its origin to Babylon. It was left for the modern specialist to do this. It is done in the face of the silent protest of the whole Jewish record. The record itself is absolute with reference to Moses. It may also be said that the rabbinical school knew nothing of any scheme, past or present, to counterfeit or simulate a history of Israel. All the historical and law books were taken at their face value, as were also the prophecies, so far as they came up for rabbinical appraisal.

Thus I have sought in the introductory number of this series to meet the challenge of the more radical amongst us that it is in order to answer the scientific objections of critical experts who have achieved ascendancy over so many great minds. I have set, and am preparing further to set, proof derived from reliable sources, and from the record itself, against what I am not alone in believing to be little better than a tissue of clever guesses and scholastic jugglings.

Destructive criticism of the Old and the New Testament

has wrought its worst. It is too much to say that the days of its influence are past; but the years of its power, at least, in any form in which hitherto it has been expressed, to confuse and distress the faith are numbered. A retrograde tendency of radical thought in the schools of Continental Europe, as also in Great Britain, the chief centers of emanation, was distinctly noticeable in the decade before the late World War. Since that debacle the movement toward inactivity, if not toward sanity and soundness, has been accelerated. Radical criticism may be said to have reached the peak of its claims and assertiveness about the beginning of this century. Its monumental triumph was the stamp which it was then able to put upon such great reference libraries as the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge" and "Hastings's Bible Dictionary," to say nothing of the "Encyclopedia Britannica" and other repositories of secular knowledge. It will be well for young students of divinity who possess early twentieth-century editions of Schaff-Herzog and of Hastings to remember that their critical and scientific articles were written in an atmosphere of radical confidence which has since cooled to a point of almost discussional lukewarmness.

Destructive criticism of the books of the New Testament canon, which reached its highest point of pragmatism in the Tübingen school, led by Ferdinand Christian Baur, began at least three decades ago to lose its footing and has so far declined in the estimation of general scholarship as to be to-day a theory without an advocate. It has shared the fate of eighteenth-century deism, out of whose ashes, left from the cremation of the body of its critical theology by the fires of the Wesleyan revival in England and the Pietistic movement in Germany, it sprang like the fabled phœnix. Destructive criticism of the Old Testament, concreted in the modern statement known as Wellhausenism, beginning farther back, and holding with a greater

tenacity the favor of the world of scholarship, is in its turn suffering a fate not different from that of Darwinian evolution. Serious criticism, holding it to be an unproved hypothesis, has come either to discredit its essential conclusions or else to treat it as a "lay over" for the leisurely tests which are to follow newly instituted lines of investigation. No intelligent student can doubt, as no capable scholar will deny, that there are many and engaging questions and problems connected with both the historical and the textual study of the two canons of Scripture. To do so would be for both student and scholar to stand self-convicted of ignorance or else of a lack of candor. But reverent criticism is now thoroughly steadied in the confidence that each of these questions and problems will yield to answers and solutions quite consonant with faith in the divine origin and purpose of the Scriptures. This is the main tenet for the young divinity student to fix well in his creed, it is the ideal to which he should work and to which his studies and thinking should be drawn, the anchor which he should keep ready against any possible storm. In the ministry of this comfort let him go to his study of the Scriptures and to his theological work, as his fathers before him went—namely, in the belief that what is written is an inerrant message from God and that the ground of his gospel is an impregnable rock.

New Evidence in Egyptology.

The most dazzling discovery in the history of Egyptology, the finding of the tomb of King Tut-ankh-amen, at Luxor, may well we said to constitute itself *a crisis in Pentateuchal criticism.* Though the full details of this discovery probably will not be given to the world for two years to come, enough is already known to show that the event has a tremendous bearing on the traditional view of Israelitish history. The astounding wealth of the funerary relics of this Pharaoh, amounting in the gross to tens of

millions of dollars, is now a familiar tale to the peoples of all lands; but far surpassing their value as expressed in material units is the testimony which these relics bear to the truth of the Bible, by reason of the light which they throw on contemporaneous history and especially on the history of the early Israelitish people.

The marvelous skill represented in the wood workmanship stored in the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen—namely, in chariots and their bodies and wheels, in chairs, couches, settles, in chests and keel boats, and in the equally astounding artifice represented in beaten gold, in alabaster carvings, as also in the cutting and inscribing of precious stones—brings a sudden and tremendous support to the stories of the Pentateuch, and furnishes a hitherto unparalleled outside evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the same. This evidence we shall assess in a brief statement added to this brochure.

Since the time of Wilhelm Vatke, and up to a very recent date, one of the stock arguments against the claim of the wilderness origin of the Israelitish priesthood and its concomitant ceremonials and appointments was the alleged impossibility at that date, from a mechanical and artistic viewpoint, of the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, the ephod of Aaron, the Urim and Thummim, and the golden vessels, altars, and tables of the priestly service, as described in the Israelitish history books. Neither the materials nor the skill were at hand, so it was contended, to make these possible on the scale described. Hastings's Dictionary (See article, "Tabernacle") asserts that these are "irreconcilable" with the idea of the "development of Israelitish religion"; that is, of course, the higher critical idea. But the exhibited contents of King Tut-ankh-amen's tomb have put this cavil forever to silence.

The exact date of Tut-ankh-amen's reign is yet to be determined, but the fact is now indisputable that he was either a contemporary of Moses, or else reigned in the age

immediately preceding that of the lawgiver, probably being the last king of the eighteenth dynasty. This creates a new and powerfully effective date. The material resources and possibilities which attended the experience and efforts of Moses in building up in the wilderness a national administration, and in creating the conditions and ritual of a national religion; and also the standard of folk consciousness and civilization upon which, with divine aid, he built, can now easily be judged of. In Tut-ankh-amen's tomb is the material, moral, intellectual, and spiritual portrait of a Pharaoh at his best, but a Pharaoh without divine illumination. Moses was also a Pharoah at his best, but plus a Hebrew consciousness and a divine illumination. That is the unalterable standard by which Moses and his work are to be judged.

The writings of the Old Testament, and particularly those of Moses, are to be taken as ancient literature at its best, but clarified from polytheistic error and dross, and shot through with the light of a divine inspiration and power. This is the fact which explains the "source" problem of the Pentateuch, the Babylonian law likenesses in the codes of Israel, and the other points of Old Testament and world thought juxtaposition. This is the new and impregnable position of traditional faith in the Holy Scriptures.

But to return to Tut-ankh-amen's tomb and the Pentateuch. By far the most significant object found in the tomb was the shrine or miniature temple in which the mummy of the king had been lying in long and regal state. This "naos" is thus described by the official correspondent who, through the Associated Press, reported the details of the discovery for the people of America. He says:

I am now able to give a detailed account of the gorgeous relics found in the mysterious inner chamber of Pharaoh Tut-ankh-amen's tomb. One enters a narrow aperture cut in the wall that separates the two chambers, and the first sight that greets the eye is a huge

shrine or canopy which occupies almost the entire inner room. It is about 12 feet high, 16 feet long, 12 feet broad, and there is only the narrowest passage around or between it and the walls of the room. It is probably made of costly cedar of Lebanon. The entire canopy is covered with goldleaf and at the head there are a beautiful series of inlaid designs in semi-precious stones and enamel.

At the other end of the canopy are two folding doors; these, when found, were bolted and sealed with the seal of Tut-ankh-amen, whose cartouches were also inscribed on the canopy itself. This great canopy is made in six pieces: four sides, the lid, and the stand. The lid curves upward at one end, as in most Egyptian shrines. In fact, one might call the whole thing a great naos or inner cell or sanctuary of the temple in which the dead king sleeps, like a god in his shrine.

In reading the description of this "inner shrine," one can but think of the shrine, or two-place sanctuary, of the tabernacle in the wilderness. The materials of which it was constructed, the fact that its sides exist in sections, that they were overlaid with gold, that its dimensions so strikingly coincide, or so nearly so, with those of "the holy of holies" in the wilderness tabernacle, point to an end which will be bitter confusion to the higher critics, as we expect to show.

I do not even suggest that there exist grounds for a future conclusion of Bible science identifying as cause and effect these points of resemblance between the shrines of Tut-ankh-amen and Moses, appointed to such different uses; but I do contend that the skill that created the "naos" of Tut-ankh-amen was present with Moses in the wilderness to build the tabernacle. The Israelites were Pharaoh's workmen, both skilled and unskilled. Who knows but a Hebrew designed and built the shrine of Tut-ankh-amen? It may be that an early decision of Egyptology will make it possible to suppose that the tomb builders of Tut-ankh-amen were the sanctuary builders of Moses. The decision must turn on a matter of decades, it may be only of years.

The assumed plentifulness of gold and silver in Egypt at

the time of the exodus is now explained. The Israelites "borrowed" jewels of silver and jewels of gold of the Egyptians; that is, they exchanged their impedimenta, their surplus belongings in furniture, cattle, and it may be in houses and lands, for the convenient equivalents of gold and silver ornaments, and so these metals were plentiful in the wilderness camp of Israel. The higher critics have scouted this "borrowing" transaction as a myth; but here again its mouth is effectually closed.

The official correspondent describes how that, within the mortuary shrine of Tut-ankh-amen, the golden figures of Nephthys and Isis, with wings spread outward and downward, brood over the place. With this the correspondent turns theologian and critic on his own account and adds: "These figures, so often seen in Egyptian art, are prototypes of the cherubim on either side of the ark of the Lord."

It is still too early to admit this conclusion as having any critical value; but Pharaonic art, which knew and expressed this ideal of hovering wings, under the inspiration of those "things into which the angels desire to look," could well have shaped in the wilderness the cherubim above the mercy seat.

I think it well to quote here the opinion of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, who long before the opening of the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen, explained that the ideals and details of the tabernacle of the Pentateuch and of Solomon's temple are *Egyptian* and not *Babylonian*, a fact impossible of explanation if the Levitical law was written in Babylon during the exile. Dr. Wilson's opinion in this matter has been very completely supported by the developments in Egyptian archæology. The student is referred to a comparative drawing on page 850 of the "Standard Bible Dictionary," M. W. Jacobus, editor in chief, showing the marked resemblance between the ground plan of the Hebrew sanctuary and the temple of Ammon at Thebes,

Ammon (Egyptian, *Amun*) being the titular Egyptian deity of Thebes, called in the Old Testament No-amon, "the City of Amun." This temple was probably built a century before the time of Moses. Now a Pharaoh of the same age gives up the secrets of his tomb to further confirm the conclusions of our great American scholar.

The Associated Press correspondent also accounts for a certain "gold-covered *box*," four by six feet, taken from Tut-ankh-amen's tomb, which was supposed originally to have contained the king's most intimate belongings. How strangely the construction and dimensions of this "box" correspond to those of the ark of the covenant! Neither our theology nor our fancy leads us to think of this box as "the prototype" of the ark of the Lord, but the materials of which it consists, the manner of its construction, as also its dimensions, show it and the ark of the covenant to belong to the same architectural age. The critics say the ark *could not have been fabricated in the wilderness.* But here is a box of almost exact details as to materials, dimensions, and workmanship, produced by the immediate predecessors of those who are credited with having fashioned the ark in the wilderness. Where are now the wise of this world?

A dozen golden articles taken from the tomb of this Pharaoh surpass, if possible, the workmanship of the seven-bowled candlestick of Moses and the golden vessels of the altars of sacrifice and incense. And what shall be said of the jewel-bedizened robes of Tut-ankh-amen found in his gold-bound chests? Will the splendid, but still, by comparison, modest, ephod of Aaron ever again seem impossible? The breastplate of the high priest, with the Urim and Thummim, and their name-engraved jewels, particularly, have been an offense to the higher critics. They could not have been produced as described! The details of their workmanship were too exquisitely difficult for that

wilderness date! But our official reporter at the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen says:

> In the space between the two golden doors at the end of the canopy and the inner sarcophagus one can see a mass of jewelry, consisting mostly of scarabs beautifully wrought in blue glaze and stone, one big scarab made of jasper being perhaps the most beautiful ever found.
>
> The name of Tut-ankh-amen is engraved upon them.

Evidence so strong and conclusive as this does not need comment. If a year ago we had been told the story of king Tut-ankh-amen's tomb, we should have classed it with the tale of Aladdin's cave; to-day it is as real as the Pyramids. But the Word of God shall stand when the Pyramids are no more!

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Part I

Number 2

The History of the Israelitish Priesthood

By

MARTIN KEGEL, Ph.D.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1923

THE AFTERMATH SERIES.---Part I

Number 1.—"The Crisis of Criticism," by the Editor.

Number 2.—"The History of the Israelitish Priesthood," by Martin Kegel, Ph.D., Student Lecturer, Joachimstal Gymnasium, Templin; also late Inspector at the Theological Seminar, Wittenberg, Germany. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 3.—"The Religious Reformation of Ezra," by Martin Kegel, Lic.Thl., Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER TWO.

The History of the Israelitish Priesthood.

BY MARTIN KEGEL, PH.D., STUDENT LECTURER, JOACHIMSTAL GYMNASIUM, TEMPLIN (GERMANY).

Translation and Introduction by the Editor.

II.

INTRODUCTION.

It is along the line of the history of the Israelitish priesthood that destructive criticism of the Old Testament has directed its most determined assault. The reason for this is not far to seek. The record of the Levitical priesthood is the heart of Old Testament history. Moreover, the Levitical priesthood is itself the expositive of Old Testament religion; it has given to this religion its sacrificial and prophetic type, and is also the pledge of its historical integrity. If confidence in the historicity of the Levitical priesthood can be destroyed or undermined—in a word, if it can be shown that the Aaronic high priesthood and the Levitical prerogatives were but an afterthought of Israelitish history, mere developments from cultic incidents and tendencies, why, then, it can be proved that the traditional view of the Bible is erroneous, and criticism will hold the field in undisputed possession.

But what, it may be asked, is the purpose, at bottom, of this radical process with the history of the Old Testament? It is simply this: With the advent of the *a priori* philosophy of Hegel, which demands that spiritual and material things be subjected to one and the same test, which is positive denial of the existence of spiritual phenomena; and with the coming of the monistic evolution of the nineteenth century, the critics have been led captive of the idea that the religion of the Old Testament, as also that of theNew, could have come only through a process of natural development and transmutation. This, of course, left no place for miracles, for a theistic revelation, or for the working out of any extraordinary divine purpose in history. The Israelit-

ish religion, with its priesthood and ceremonies, must have come by the path of a slow cultic or social evolution. Such is the conclusion of this criticism.

This view of criticism supposes the so-called "Jahwe religion," the faith of Abraham, Moses, and Joshua, to have developed on the foundation of the older Semitic religion, the religion of Abraham's forbears in Babylon, followed by a syncretism of religions, chiefly of the "Jahwe religion" and those of the Canaanites and other nations of Palestine. As a finality, this syncretism was transmuted into the ethical religion represented by the Hebrew prophets and in culminating Levitical and ceremonial laws, fabricated out of hand, but attributed to Moses.

This is the rigid hypothesis which the critics have brought to the treatment of the Old Testament. It is a refinement of the evolutionistic theories of Herbert Spencer and the other nineteenth-century monists. This evolutionistic rule is laid upon the face of the Old Testament, and whatever in the record contradicts it is incontinently thrust aside as "interpolation," or intentional "anachronism." To this rule, naturally, the written history of the Jewish people has offered the most constant contradiction. Hence the persistency of the assault made upon it by the higher critics.

I readily anticipate an objection coming from that body of would-be higher critics amongst us—not large, but too large, as heaven knows—that these strictures are more of heat than proof. Once for all then, let it be said that honest tolerance amongst us for the conclusions of the higher critical school is more of *innocence* than knowledge. To read an essay such as that of Dr. Kegel's, which this foreword is meant to introduce to the readers of the "Aftermath Series," if it does not convince any student marked from the inkhorn of pragmatism, should at least put him to sober thinking, which can lead sober patience to but one conclusion.

The purpose of this series is not so much to go into a detailed traversal of the vast inane of the higher critical deductions as thoroughly to uncover a few of its lines of advance, and show what perilous risks it has taken, and to what completely unsupported ends the hypothesis has been brought. Our wish is to so link up and emphasize the main points in the argument against the higher critical position that they may become intelligible and effective in the hands of the least technical of our readers. It is a mistaken notion that a mastery of numerous languages and the ability to use the technique of Bible science are indispensable to an understanding of Old Testament history. The determinative, at last, turns on a few simple points, such as the one now being considered, *the history of the Israelitish priesthood.* If a sound and proper judgment be formed concerning this record, little difficulty will be experienced in reading and construing both the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament in the light of traditional faith.

Let the essay of Dr. Kegel be studied with this thought of the importance of the history of the priesthood in mind. Observe that Dr. Kegel has discussed and answered the following-named points in the higher critical hypotheses:

(1) In the oldest records of Israel the primitive tribe of Levi possesses a peculiarly secular status, and is thereby so depreciated as to make the suggestion of it as the source of the Israelitish priesthood repugnant to the ideal of sanctity which is claimed for it.

(2) As a matter of fact, Moses did not establish the Aaronic priesthood, or any other sacerdotal order, in the wilderness. With this disclaimer goes also the corollary that no functions of any sort or degree were assigned to the Levites as a tribe.

(3) Whatever priestly or sacerdotal services were rendered in these primitive times of Israel, including the

wilderness history, were by men who came forward on their own recognizance, or by the general tolerance of the people.

(4) Soon after the settlement in Canaan, and during the times of the Judges, whoever chose to do so was at liberty to offer the sacrifice. Particularly, the eldest born son of each Israelitish family was held to possess priestly privileges.

(5) That any person who elected to follow the religious calling as a profession—that is, to offer sacrifice as a priest—was known as a "Levite"; not because he may have been a member of the tribe of Levi, but for some reason not accounted for in the record he was so called.

(6) At this time there was in Israel no central sanctuary. Every man who chose had his "teraphim" and his own "house of gods," and either invested his first-born son with an ephod, or else hired a priest for his sanctuary.

(7) At some indefinite time in the history of Israel, circles or groups of priests began to form about particular sanctuaries, and thus the idea of a class or family priesthood took shape; but this had not yet inured to the particular advantage of the tribe of Levi.

(8) Samuel, who in tender childhood was dedicated to the holy office in the sanctuary at Shiloh, was, so the critics say, of non-Levitical descent, thus showing that even at that late date the Levitical priesthood did not exist.

(9) Whatever priesthood existed in the times of David and Solomon was non-Levitical, or only Levitical in that undefined sense in which a priest of whatever blood was called a "Levite"; only now the tribal increment was in the first stages of evolution.

(10) The kings of Judah and Israel at their pleasure offered sacrifices, and thus is proved the non-existence of a special Levitical priesthood.

(11) The sons of David are catalogued as priests (so the critics read from a most uncertain passage, of which more

later). But David and his sons were of the tribe of Judah, and so the priesthood could not have inhered in the tribe of Levi.

(12) Toward the latter end of the Israelitish monarchy, it appears that sacrifices were being offered at many places throughout Judah and Benjamin. The priests of these altars were not all idolaters, but some of them belonged in the class of Jehovah high place priests, who, as the critics say, are to be regarded as the successors of the old-time peripatetic so-called "Levites," who had never ceased to be an element in Israelitish religious life.

(13) During the reign of Josiah, a comparatively short time before the fall of the monarchy, Hilkiah and his confederate priests fabricated a book of laws which they ascribed to Moses, and put it into the hands of the king as an ancient code of Israel. The purpose of this book was to concentrate all worship in Jerusalem; to bring in the Jehovah high place priests from over the kingdom and constitute one priesthood in the temple at the capital, a thing which had not before been seen.

(14) According to this hypothesis, the priests in Jerusalem objected to having the high place priests put on a parity with themselves, but agreed that they might be admitted to an inferior service in the temple. The hypothesis also insists that this was the beginning of the difference between "priests" and "Levites." This distinction was unlawful; but the prophet Ezekiel sought to make it legal. While these matters were in controversy, as it might be said, the final deportation into Babylon took place. The book fabricated by Hilkiah is designated as D, and is regarded as having contained at least the main legal sections of Deuteronomy. This book was preserved through the exile, to have such further treatment as we shall later hear about.

(15) Near the close of the Babylonian exile, the priests in Babylon fabricated another book after the manner of

Hilkiah's deception, which, according to this hypothesis, contained the main sections of the Levitical law as it appears in our Pentateuch. This book was also claimed to be an ancient law, "spoken by the hand of Moses."

(16) With this exilic law book (called P) in his hand, Ezra, in coöperation with Nehemiah, undertook to restore the temple and its worship in Jerusalem. This new law recognized, for the first time in Israelitish history, the office of the high priesthood, and established that office exclusively with the sons of Aaron. At the same time it made the tribal Levites to be the only legitimate priests in Israel, and distinguished two orders in the sacerdotal office, priests in particular and Levites in general.

(17) In the belief that it has established this order of history, the higher criticism rejects as spurious practically every claim made in the historical sections of the Pentateuch. These sections, according to the hypothesis, were written as an "envelope" for the fabricated laws of D and P. The creators of this "envelope" were certain schools of the later prophets and priests, and hence are distinguished amongst a number of other "source" writers as Ph and Pg and are in some other way, not fully explained, connected with the two codes, D and P.

(18) Equally also the history contained in the books of Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah is "purposeful"—that is, it was written with the purpose to project a spurious history of the Israelitish priesthood and its ceremonials backward into those centuries "when as yet there was none of them."

Our readers will see how much of this hypothesis remains after they have read Dr. Kegel's very able presentation of the case. Dr. Kegel's argument, while avoiding unnecessary technicalities, is detailed and incisive. With reference Bible at hand, the reader must visualize and follow each Scriptural aspect and connection with which he deals. It must be undersood that higher criticism has attacked

the very vitals of the Old Testament, and that no casual answer will meet the attack. It is a surface study of criticism that has led so many to capitulate to unsupported demands. The time has come for close inquiry.

Dr. Kegel is one of the foremost of the younger scholars of Germany, a type and forerunner of that newer school of reconstructive critics in Germany who in a better future are to deliver their country from the opprobrium which has come upon it through being chiefly responsible for the promotion of the doctrines of destructivism. Dr. Kegel is a member and minister of the Evangelical Church, was formerly student inspector in the theological seminary at Wittenberg, but is at present serving as student lecturer at the Joachimstal Gymnasium in Templin. Like St. Augustine, laboring at Hippo amid the distress and ravage of old world war to bring to finality his "City of God," Dr. Kegel is laboring on amid the distresses of the aftermath of a new world war as a leader in the work of reconstructing the faith of his countrymen in the Word of God as anciently delivered to the saints. I bespeak for him the prayers of sympathetic brethren in happier America. Should any who read his present essay desire to send him a brotherly message of cheer or express sympathy in the great work he is doing at such tremendous odds, I shall be more than glad to transmit the same.

HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITISH PRIESTHOOD.

THE Old Testament science of to-day is waging a heavy warfare. The anti-Semitism called into play through the assertiveness of modern-day Judaism has left no means untried to strike that Judaism a deadly blow. It not only takes into the line of its sight the discredited commercial element of the existing Jewish race, the justice of which may be allowed, but it attacks Judaism on its spiritual foundations, in the Talmud and in—the Old Testament.

That the assaults on the Old Testament have often overshot the mark is clearly revealed in the newest publications of Delitzsch. Upon Biblical scholarship now falls the duty of defending the Old Testament from these unjustifiable assaults. That the task is not being shunned will appear from a study of such strong refutations as are to be found in the writings of Koenig and Sellin. Delitzsch and others—let it be said once for all—had not generally been able to celebrate so cheap a victory had not Biblical science, throughout a decade, from within sponsored as irrefutable fact their widely disseminated intellectual pretensions for which absolutely no justifying proofs were produced. Ten years ago, in the introduction to my work on Wilhelm Vatke, I uttered bitter words against these pretensions, and pointed out the fact that Julius Wellhausen, the talented Goetingen professor, on many matters of Old Testament criticism has stated and defended the most daring and dangerous hypotheses. It is not too much to say that Wellhausen has become the chief offender in this rôle. His construction of the history of Israel, which existing Old Testament criticism has so largely followed, streams from unsupported assertions. With stupefied confidence, these assertions are accepted by his followers as having been absolutely proved.

In the following pages I desire, in a few examples taken from the history of the Israelitish priesthood, as Wellhausen has sketched it, to bring my charge to statement. I also hold myself for a later and fuller traversing of Wellhausen's construction of this history.[1]

According to Wellhausen, in the primitive times of Israel the tribe of Levi possessed only a secular status, which, as shown in Genesis xlix. 5 ff., was as unspiritual as could well be imagined. This tribe, so Wellhausen opines, by the time of the conquest of Canaan had become basic in secularity. In the times of the Judges and in the times of the older kings of Israel arose that austere difference between things holy and profane, which was later established in custom, when it was no longer allowed that every man might offer the sacrifice. At that time the name "Levite" described a single person who as a profession followed the religious calling. Since, however, in the course of time, the priestly personnel became numerous, it built itself into a standing of consequence, which, as such, Deuteronomy xxxiii. sets aside from the other tribes of Israel. And it was out of this personal priestly class that first, and subsequently, the office of priest became hereditary in a family cohesion.

Concerning these so widely accepted statements of Wellhausen, it may be confidently observed that only one is correct—namely, that in the primitive times of Israel the tribe of Levi had a secular standing. However, the supposition that Genesis xlix. 5 ff. is intended to be a discrediting prejudgment of the tribe in the time of the

---

[1]This refers to the work by Dr. Kegel entitled "Away from Wellhausen" (*Los von Wellhausen*), to appear in the second part of this series. The work of translation is approaching completion; and we can promise our readers the most illuminating and instructive short work on criticism ever at any time printed on either side of the waters. Wellhausenism crumbles under this searching analysis. —*The Editor.*

Judges is a wholly untenable one. From the seventeenth chapter of Judges, which, according to Wellhausen's own reckoning, is of a very old traditional value, it follows that certainly during and soon after the conquest of the land of Canaan by the Israelites the "Levite" was in high esteem and held next to complete possession of the religious office. That at almost the same time at which one sees in Israel the secular tribe of Levi moving on the moral level of the Canaanites, the designation "Levite" should be an honored title for "one who as a profession followed the religious calling" is as improbable as it is possible to imagine. But, alas for us, "the times of Moses, as those which immediately precede and follow it, lie in darkness." [So the critics confidently inform us.]

With reference to this statement it is at present only necessary to say that it seems but logical that Moses should have put his family and racial branch, indeed the whole tribe of Levi, to which he appertained, in peculiar possession of the new religious establishment. This is at once seen to correspond to what we discover has elsewhere happened in the analogues of world history. Compare, for instance, the place assigned to James the brother of Jesus in the primitive Church; as also the preferment of the relatives of Mohammed after the prophet's death. In a somewhat different sphere stands the relation of the tribe of Judah to David, as that relation is set forth in 2 Samuel xx., and further.

Moses had probably not succeeded in his plans without the strong support of his own family; and such support was further strengthened when, as the founder of the religious system, he clothed success in palpable forms. Thus we have distinct and trustworthy indications that the activities of the oldest Israelitish priest family were derived directly from Moses. Something not unlike this often happened in the preferential selection of bishops in the

Middle Ages, in spite of the Catholic Church's always valid doctrines given in 1 Timothy iii. 1 ff.

We must not conclude, however, that in committing a highly spiritual program to the direction of his kinsmen and fellow tribesmen, Moses designed that all the members of his branch or tribe were to be employed in the carrying out of this program. The presentation of the case in the Israelitish tradition was this: a family and a tribe fellowship with a distinct clerical standing were by Moses, the founder, bound to the service of the Israelitish religion, as is consistently pictured to us in the Old Testament account of the times of the Judges.

In this connection, it appears that, after the entrance of the Israelites into the land of Canaan, those Levites who were not actually engaged with the priestly functions simply were settled in the possessions of the other tribes. It is possible that Genesis xlix. 5 ff. is a forecast of this fact. The particular business of the Levites was fallen into temporary neglect. Many of them, being only in the widest sense intrusted with cultural responsibility, took up the unauthorized service of Jehovah in the high places of the land. Others actually went as priests into the service of idols. Yet this they knew, that, collectively and in the most valid sense, they were regarded by the people of Israel as of the "priestly" caste.

However, the kindred of the tribes which loyally maintained the legitimate service of Jehovah turned later, ever more and more, to acknowledge the priestly office only in the sanctuary. The otherwise tolerated sacerdotal service was, in turn, more and more expressed in a subordinate temple employment, of which we are yet to speak.

As a matter of fact, then, Wellhausen has no reasonable ground upon which to support his boldly asserted contention that there exists no real relationship between the old secular tribe of Levi and the later Levitical caste of the Pentateuch; that "Levite" was originally genealogical,

then appellative, and that finally again it became genealogical. As fully also has Wellhausen failed in his effort to glean an appellative meaning for the word "Levite" from the blessing of Moses in Deuteronomy xxxiii. 8–11.

He declares: "The persistently affirmed solidarity of the status of the Levites in no wise rests on the natural foundation of the tribal or family unity; the priest does not make the blood; rather, on the contrary, it makes the denial of the blood, and that with peculiar emphasis." The priest must do the will of Jehovah, as having neither father nor mother, brother nor child. Because he has in this sense devoted himself to the service of Jehovah, he turns away from the domestic relation and tears himself loose from the family bond. Palpably, much of this ingenious explanation is open to contradiction. I will, however, only ask this question: How shall we demonstrate to ourselves that a class blessing of the "Levites" was thrust into the middle of a blessing pronounced upon the whole secular tribe of Levi? That had been quite as if in a hymn of the Franks, Saxons, or Frisians we should find abruptly inserted a ritual, say of the Romish clergy![1]

The analogy extends also to the Jacob blessing in Genesis xlix. There, by reason of the mention of Levi's standing as one of the members of a tribal community, as Reuben or Judah, one is rather led to think of the Jacob blessing and the Moses blessing as not being so far apart in point of time as Wellhausen takes them to be. The sense of Deuteronomy xxxiii. 8–11 is, moreover, natural that, as

---

[1]Special attention is directed to this use of Deuteronomy xxxiii. 8-11 by the critics. The inference appears to be that verse 9 refers to a "personal" priestly cult of the old supposed peripatetic "Levite" class. This verse would therefore have no relation to the tribal blessing of the other verses of the passage. This it is that gives point to Dr. Kegel's satire. It seems to us that the destructive critic might read a wholesome warning from the latter clauses of the eleventh verse.—*The Editor.*

the Urim and Thummim appertained to the tribe of Levi, the word and the law of Jehovah should be placed by the Levite before father and mother, son or daughter. In this connection, I recall the words of Emperor William that the soldier's banner binds him under all circumstances; and if it lead him against his nearest of kin, it must even then be followed. The single one of Wellhausen's cited passages, that of Exodus iv. 14, which one can allow to be applicable as containing appellatively the name of "Levite," is thus by Harold M. Wiener correctly interpreted: "The expression, 'Aaron thy brother, the Levite,' used by Jehovah in a dialogue with Moses, is not more noteworthy than would be the expression, 'Your brother, William Smith,' in a conversation carried on in our own day with Alfred Smith concerning the latter's brother. It is safe to say, however, that in such a case the customary form, 'Your brother William,' would be used; although each one of us out of personal experience knows that it gives opportunity to choose the fuller form."

The theories of Wellhausen concerning the serious civic depression of the tribe of Levi at the time of the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, and of the appellative significance of the designation "Levite" in the first century after the settlement of Israel in Canaan, are unqualifiedly erroneous. Equally false, as it seems to me, is all the rest which is contained in his before-mentioned statements.

Was there really and generally no difference between holy and profane in the times of the Judges? In that age was every one who chose to do so at liberty to offer a sacrifice? Wellhausen declares: "In the kernel of the book of Judges, chapters iii.–xvii., there nowhere appears a person who follows the religious office as a calling. In two cases sacrifices were offered, once by Gideon and again by Manoah, the service of a priest therefor not being needed."

Looking now somewhat closely at the first of the

cases named, we are led to ask what Wellhausen and all who agree with him really think of the situation of Gideon. In the position in which he is represented to us, could Gideon possibly have sent for a priest? And supposing that at the time everywhere in Israel it was known that in the least regular manner a ritual personal sacrifice was unlawful; indeed, supposing that a valid sacrifice had never before been offered without priestly mediation; Gideon, in the circumstances under which he found himself placed, must have felt called to assume for the time being the authority of the sacerdotal office. Indeed, with him, the offering of a sacrifice became personal through a divine command, behind which he must have perceived the mysterious power of Jehovah! (Judges vi. 16 ff., xx.) And was he not then and there through the Theophany consecrated to the priesthood, just as Isaiah, through that purification of which Jehovah permitted him to partake, was prepared to become a prophet? However, we undertake to say, if it were found written in the text—a thing unthinkable—that "Gideon sent for a priest," Wellhausen and all who travel in his way instantly would cry out: "It is as clear as noonday that this is an interpolation!"

Quite the same is it with the events related in the story of Manoah (Judges xiii. 1 ff.), for which reason I have no need at this time to go into particulars. Instead, I shall quote in correction what Hengstenberg has to say concerning these two cases, as, since the second half of the nineteenth century, in Old Testament learning and general Church history, he has been of encouragement to the science. Very correctly Hengstenberg says: "The appearance to Gideon was in itself a declaration of God that he communicated with him without the customary priestly mediation, which he now himself shared." Hengstenberg further says: "We learn through the whole period of the Judges of but a single instance afterwards (that of Ma-

noah) where, under the usual circumstances of such offerings, a conscious and confessed worshiper of Jehovah brought a sacrifice without the offices of the priestly order."

Is it a wonder that a science in which such arbitrary methods are employed as are invoked by Wellhausen in the treatment of these two cases should be by Delitzsch and other adversaries of modern Judaism selected as a favorable field in which to promote the cause of anti-Semitism?

As far astray as Wellhausen has gone in the treatment of the two cases just cited, I hold that he is equally wrong in the treatment of the already considered seventeenth chapter of Judges. And here he has in no way profited from the performances of his predecessors, the older critics, who have cultivated such unpromising ground. Here, as so often elsewhere, he has simply brought forward statements found in the earlier works of Wilhelm Vatke, as, for instance, in his "Biblical Theology Scientifically Stated" (1835). "It appears," says Wellhausen, "that when Micah employed a priest under wages for his sanctuary he was but following a general custom. The man whom he might install as priest remained only during his pleasure. When otherwise no one was available, he consecrated one of his own sons to be a priest, not with a *character indelibilis* is naturally to be supposed, as one can see in the first instance, where Micah's son after a brief period retires from service." See Judges xvii. 5; 1 Samuel vii. 1.

Hengstenberg, in a glance at the conduct of the Danites in this case (Judges xviii.), remarks quite correctly against Vatke that "we cannot pass upon the acts and excesses, for instance, of the first Spanish conquerors of America without considering the religious and moral conditions under which the Spaniard of that period was brought up." He then draws to the side of his argument this convincing

conclusion: "It must be considered as conclusive for the status of the tribal Levite as the privileged servant of God that Micah is so convinced that a regularly descended member of the tribe of Levi possessed the power to dispense sanctity and blessing that he said, 'Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest.'" (Judges xvii. 13.)[1]

I desire now to expound these cases of Micah and the Danites by means of an illustration taken from our ritual for emergency baptism (*Nottaufe*). In case of the life extremity of an unbaptized infant, where no *rite vocatus* can be provided, baptism may be administered by any adult layman. When, however, the time for the *rite vocatus* arrives, the layman naturally is passed by, and the family rejoices that the rite can be celebrated in the regular way. Should one read that, in the latter part of the year 1000 A.D. in a remote corner of Germany, a family member had administered baptism because as yet no priest or minister had gone that way; from a decision taken at that distance would one be justified in stating that ever afterwards in Germany any one who chose to do so could administer the rite of baptism? And that conditions generally were so disordered that a regular ministry amongst us was not possible? According to Wellhausen, one must so conclude. But surprising as it may appear, scarcely one of the critics who have adopted his construction of Israelitish history development has contradicted him at this point. On the contrary, the account in Judges xvii. is generally construed as Wellhausen has construed it.

If it was indeed a fact, as Wellhausen is pleased to state, that in the time of the Judges every one who chose to do so

[1]The critical contention for a non-Levitical priesthood, arguing from the incident of Micah and the Danites, utterly overlooks the force of Judges xvii. 6: "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." There was conscious violation of statute and tradition.—*The Editor.*

exercised the priestly function, wherein was it at all necessary to establish the legitimacy of one of the sons of Micah to be a priest? Not one of Wellhausen's followers has controverted the statement that in the old Israelitish times the first-born son of every family possessed unquestioned priestly privileges. If this Micah, separated from the body of his people, in the absence of a *rite vocatus*, could legitimately appoint to the priesthood his eldest son, which assuredly is not stated in Judges xvii., he could as legitimately have handled the case otherwise.

Wellhausen, however, goes really further. He daringly affirms, as has been shown, that in the comparatively later times of which we last spoke the sacrifice was in general use, and that only about single sanctuaries was a particular priesthood gathered, which priesthood was first only at a relatively late date confined to one family blood. In order to defend this theory, Wellhausen and many of his partisans, as we have seen, have sought further to "purge" the text of alleged later interpolations, thus generalizing particular and separate facts in the most unjustifiable fashion.

An instance of this first-named offense runs to the treatment of the account found in 1 Samuel vi. According to Wellhausen, at verse 15 of this chapter occurs a late insertion in the text, where Levites are brought forward to a time before the particular or tribal Levite was known as a priest. Speaking in the thought of Wellhausen, and with reference to this alleged interpolation, Kittel says: "It will make it manifest that, in the sense of D and P, before the seizing of the ark by the Philistines the sacrifice was offered without the services of the Levites." But, unfortunately, neither Kittel nor Wellhausen reveals to us wherefore *priests* are not brought forward in this same interpolation, alleged to belong to a time when, at least in the sense of P, priests were regarded as necessary to the validity of the sacrifice. Wiener is again quite correct in

the position that the return of the ark occurred under such peculiarly politic conditions that no conclusion of special significance can be drawn from the incidents connected with it.

That the text in 1 Samuel vi. 14 f. is not in complete arrangement seems apparent. However, a stylistic difficulty does not justify one, *vie et armis*, in eliding from the real content of the text what may happen to contradict a partisan construction of history. False generalization—that was the second of the previously censured errors of Wellhausen—has been drawn from the forced construction of the story found in 1 Samuel i.–iii. Nor do the critics emphasize Wellhausen's conclusions regarding the statement that, according to 1 Samuel ii. 14, "all Israel gathered to Shiloh," for such a thing as an exclusive sanctuary in Israel at that time must not be admitted, if Wellhausen's theory of the development of the religious history of the Israelites is to stand. Nor, again, are the critics willing to emphasize the fact that, according to 1 Samuel ii. 12 ff., the respect for the priesthood in Shiloh must have been great and well rooted, since serious abuses were endured by the people without apparent protest.[1]

The critics make the most volatile experiments to rid themselves of the fatal verse of 1 Samuel ii. 22, which does not at all harmonize with Wellhausen's construction of history. Kittel divides this verse into distiches (half verses), as being "not original," and declares that it is based on Exodus xxxviii. 8. If we turn to the Bible translation by Kautzsch, we will find there (Ex. xxxviii. 8) the statement by the translator: "This gloss, which probably was taken from 1 Samuel ii. 22, forgets that as yet there was no tabernacle of the congregation." Thus Wellhausen's process of reasoning holds itself, as I have pre-

[1]The reference is to the forbearance of the people concerning the conduct of the sons of Eli.—*The Editor.*

viously indicated in my work on Josiah, "often by its own forelock, swaying above the ground."

Again, the very extraordinary case of the boy Samuel, not of Levitical descent, in earliest youth, given to the priesthood in the tabernacle at Shiloh, which certainly was little primitive, must, in the construction of Israelitish priesthood history, as the critics say, lend itself to the conclusion that the heredity of the priesthood was not regarded in that day. And this is in spite of the fact that in the same story (1 Sam. ii. 27 ff.) the heredity of the office of priest since the days of Moses is especially emphasized, exactly as in the case of the older account of Judges xviii. 30.

We note here that the theory of the non-Levitical descent of Samuel is absolutely questionable. Hengstenberg says: "The theory that Samuel was not a Levite is willfully arbitrary; in that it puts aside the grounds named in connection with the Ephrathite in 1 Samuel i. 1, which brings to the same simple conclusion as does the phrase, 'out of the family of Judah,' in Judges xvii. 7, after which comes the according remark: 'and he was a Levite and dwelt there as a stranger.' It follows therefrom that the Levites were numbered with the tribes in whose midst they dwelt. This it was that made Judaic Levites, Ephraimitish Levites, and so on." And Wiener remarks: "All the Elkanahs who came forward in Israelitish history are Levites."[1]

Even in the older times of the kings, according to Well-

[1]See 1 Chronicles vi. 16 f., where the descent of Elkanah and his son, Samuel, is traced directly from Levi. But the critics have a convenient way of discounting the Chronicler, unless he happens to look in their direction. However, as Wiener has shown, all the *Elkanahs* of the Bible are set down as Levites. The critics have undertaken the impossible task of alienating the father of Samuel. The Levitical descent of Samuel is beyond successful dispute.—*The Editor.*

hausen, the priesthood was not in the sole possession of a single family, or of a tribal fellowship. Also of this time it can be said, so he asserts, that "anybody was permitted to offer sacrifices and oblations, and even in a case where a priest could be had there is detected nothing of a systematic separation to sanctity." Among other things, the critics undertake to prove that the early kings of Israel, unimpeached, offered sacrifices and bestowed ceremonial blessings. The case is instanced of David, a non-Levite, who without any ado invested his sons with the priestly office. Without question, Wellhausen is correct when he asserts that the kings of Israel (Ahaz being the last, 2 Kings xvi. 12 ff.) personally offered sacrifices. However, is that which the king does allowable to all the people? Did not Emperor William himself conduct religious services on naval ships? And are we to conclude from that act that we of the Evangelical Church are no more to lay weight on the *licentia concionanda?* The Israelitish kings doubtless as "supreme rulers of the land" took upon themselves the right of the priesthood, even if canonically the bringing of the sacrifice was permitted only to the members of a recognized family line.

One must not at all "forget in reading the Bible narrative that the kings of Israel were lords, to whom their own wills were the supreme law." Not even does the Chronicler (though charged by the critics with ultra *Leviticising* tendencies) take offense at sacrifices offered by the sovereign. See 2 Chronicles i. 6 f. The oft-repeated critical assertion of our day that the "blessing" of the kings of Israel, of which we read from time to time, in Bible history must always rank as a priestly act, is in no sense in harmony with the facts. Wiener here very correctly points out that occasionally even the formula, "In the name of Jehovah of Hosts," contradicts this assumption; and that the passage (2 Sam. vi. 20) where David blessed his house-

hold thereby witnesses that to pronounce a blessing was a common and beautiful custom with the old Israelites. Kittel and Kautzsch here characteristically sponsor the translation "to greet," rather than "to bless." In no case can one, on the fact that Israelitish kings opportunely blessed the people, prop the assertion that at this time the rights of the Levitical priesthood had not been established.

But does not the fact that David's sons were made priests (2 Sam. viii. 18) speak most positively for the theory that in those days "the priests did not have to be derived from Levi"? Wellhausen is much afraid that the words, "the sons of David were priests," might be changed "from their original meaning" in favor of the traditional view of the Pentateuch. In the matter of "changing," according to my estimate of that art, no one possesses greater mastery than Wellhausen himself. One need only think on his manipulation of the passage in 1 Kings xiii. 33.[1]

The truth is that the correctness of the word *priest* in the phrase, "the sons of David were priests" (2 Sam. viii. 18), is exceedingly doubtful;[2] however, not to come under Wellhausen's anathema, let us admit, for once, that the words

---

[1]Here Jeroboam is represented as violating in a flagrant and idolatrous way the laws of Jehovah, and yet there is a criticism that would use him as a witness against Jehovah's mandate. His priesthood was confessedly hybrid and unlawful.—*The Editor.*

[2]In our Authorized Version the last clause of 2 Samuel viii. 18 reads: "And David's sons were chief rulers." The word is *kohen*, and, according to the best authority, may mean *prince*, *ruler*, or *priest*. It is so used. The meaning is suggested by the situation, though it can generally mean only *priest*. Some doubt the correctness of the transmitted term in this passage; but to so hold smacks too much of the methods we are criticizing. With Dr. Kegel, we prefer to allow the validity of the word. The truth takes care of itself. Let the critics show where any son of David ever actually served as a priest. It cannot be proven that even Solomon, after he became king, offered sarcifice except through the priesthood. See 2 Chronicles vii. 5-7.—*The Editor.*

have been correctly transmitted. Even then it would be altogether incorrect to draw general conclusions. It would be as if one from the former custom under which the Hohenzollern princes were made lieutenants in their tenth year should draw the conclusion that in Prussia all boys of ten years of age might be made officers.

Putting our last arguments together, we should say that the assumption that far into the times of the kings of Israel about the same conditions prevailed with the Israelites as with the cult of the Greeks, in so far as the matter of sacrificing was not confined to a particular order; and that the Levitical priesthood was not, until a late date, organized around a great sanctuary, is defended by Wellhausen, and those who hold with him, with all imaginably poor arguments. As we have seen, it is a doctrine fully to be received that Moses assigned to his family the priesthood as a privilege, and to his tribe a cultural position of preference. In the storm-swept times of the conquest of Canaan, and more especially in the times of the first kings, the details of this institution were always theoretically recognized, even though the rulers repeatedly claimed cultural prerogatives for themselves. In Judah, whoever was not a born Levite (see 1 Kings xiii. 33) could not at any time be a legitimate priest.

Let us now turn more especially to the later times of the kings of Israel. Of particular significance as to the development of the Israelitish priesthood, according to the opinion of all present-day scholars, is the account of the religious reformation of Josiah (2 Kings xxii., etc.). Since I have given this history a very particular study elsewhere in my writings, I can here be brief. According to Wellhausen and all who think after him, in the time of Josiah D (and only D) was in existence. This was a law book but recently originated, which had the object of concentrating the whole system of the Israelitish worship at Jerusalem, and also to settle in Jerusalem the high place priesthood.

According to Wellhausen, provision is made in the law book (Deut. xviii. 6 ff.) for caring for the needs of Jehovah high place priests, rendered breadless through the beforementioned religious reformation. These high place priests were by this arrangement legally authorized to render priestly service in Jerusalem along with the resident priesthood. Further, according to Wellhausen, Josiah had the purpose to carry out this law; but the good intentions of the lawmakers and the king were barred by the opposition of the resident Jerusalem priests, who were not willing to admit the former high place priests to share service with them in the central sanctuary (2 Kings xxiii. 9).

If these former high place priests desired to be employed in the temple of Jehovah, then, according to Wellhausen, they must be content with rendering an inferior service. "Thus," says Wellhausen in his "Prolegomena," "was established at the conclusion of the preëxilic age (as an illegal outcome of the reformation of Josiah) the difference between *priest* and *Levite*, which Ezekiel afterwards sought to legalize."

In my writings on Josiah, opposing the above-stated position, I defended the following theses, to which I respectfully call the reader's attention:

To say that about the year 620 B.C. was composed a law book for early promulgation by Josiah cannot be read from the account given in 2 Kings xxii., etc. The codex of Josiah, which must have contained D (Deuteronomy) was indeed very voluminous. But D must have been composed long before Josiah, who was surprised at the challenge of the book. The religious reformation which it promoted did not at all follow the main tendency of D, which is to say, the concentration of religious services at Jerusalem. Josiah's policy was concerned, first of all, with the purifying of religious worship! The account in 2 Kings xxii., etc., clearly distinguishes between the priests of idols and Jehovah priests. The first of these Josiah sought to de-

stroy; the latter he sought to draw to Jerusalem, perhaps in the view of Deuteronomy vi., etc. However, as von Orelli correctly interprets, it does mean a permanent establishment of the high place priests in Jerusalem. But the Jehovah high place priests, as it appears, did not submit to being transplanted without protest. They met the policy of Josiah with passive opposition, although presumably Josiah sought to recognize them in the order of the full priesthood, and not in the order of the second grade, who later came to be designated simply as "Levites."

If we accept the words of 2 Kings xxii., etc., as they should be accepted, according to my explanation, then Wellhausen's construction of the history of the Israelitish priesthood suffers a serious breach—a breach which is all the greater since the citation which he makes from Ezekiel is to be construed quite differently from the way in which he construes it. However, of this we will come directly to speak more particularly. Then again, in 2 Kings xxii., etc., there is no mention made of a protest of the Jerusalem priest circle against the incoming of the Jehovah high place priests, of which moreover we know not one syllable! Wherefore the statement of Wellhausen that "the difference between priest and Levite did not exist before that time" becomes in the highest sense impossible of acceptance.

The unheard-of artfulness which Wellhausen ascribes to the author of Deuteronomy must be recognized to be, what in truth it is, a pure scholastic invention. This author (also invented, as being of the time of Josiah) is said to have made provision for the high place priests, even going so far as to picture them as poor and needy, which account Wellhausen ascribes to the law book given of God to Moses! But this is only in line with all his other statements concerning the imaginative and deceptive meanings with which he has clothed the religious reformation of Josiah.

But we go now a step further and come to Ezekiel. One of the most vulnerable positions in the presentation of the development of the history of the Israelitish priesthood, which has become popular through Wellhausen's initiative, is the use that has been made of the words and acts of this prophet. What Wellhausen says concerning Ezekiel xliv. 9 ff. is so unimaginable and contradictory that one does not know what further to expect as one proceeds to unwind his skein of crooked statements and unproven guesses. We also emphasize this against Wellhausen—namely, that in a series of cases it stands simply fixed that Ezekiel's reform program had not the smallest influence on the course of the history of the Israelitish ritual. We mention only the following:

1. Ezekiel would expressly forbid that in future aliens should be permitted to perform any sort of service in the temple, as was the case before the exile. On this prohibition, as Wiener has well shown, Ezekiel rests everything; and he would bring the difference between holy and unholy to a rigorous issue. Nevertheless, the service of the non-Israelitish slave remained in vogue even after the exile. See Nehemiah vii. 46 ff.; Ezra xlii. 43 ff.

2. Ezekiel does not mention the feast of weeks, which certainly existed before his time, as Wiener has correctly shown. Also later times in this respect have not been affected in the least by Ezekiel's program.

3. In his cultural plan, Ezekiel does not so much as mention the high priest. If this office did not exist before Ezekiel's time, then it follows that it came in under Zerubbabel (Hag. i. 1 ff.; Zech. iii. 1, 8); that the shaping of the hierarchy in the exile followed without regard to Ezekiel's writings. If, however, the office of high priest existed before the exile, and if Ezekiel intentionally ignored its existence, the just cited passages from Haggai and Zechariah

indicate that they have simply passed over Ezekiel's silent protest to the order of the day.[1]

To my mind these three cases are clear. Köberle says: "The actual circumstances shape themselves throughout not according to Ezekiel's wishes." Von Baudissin gives it as his opinion that "nowhere is there found a trace of evidence that Ezekiel's law of the religious community was of binding force. What it signified of personal obligation was not of statutory authority." Gressman must, for his part, concede: "The plans of Ezekiel were not fully realized." But I go further than Gressman and say that if such unequivocal proof be at hand that Ezekiel's scheme for the reconstruction of weighty matters of the hierarchy proved so ineffective, it is thoroughly unbelievable that in another and thoroughly unidentified case he should have influenced the development of the hierarchy. According to Wellhausen, as we have already heard, Ezekiel endeavored to legalize the difference between *clerus major* and *clerus minor*, which had been put in process by the religious reformation of Josiah; indeed, as Wellhausen has rather patronizingly said, Ezekiel has "hung a moral mantle about the logic of the facts!" And he realized in this purpose such complete success that after the exile the difference between priest and Levite was actually established!

The former high place priests clearly suspected, as Wellhausen holds, that, because of the statements of Ezekiel, their position after the return to Jerusalem would become little enviable, and on this account it was that

[1]The effectiveness of this logic must be studied to be fully appreciated. The critics claim that Ezekiel is largely responsible for the pronounced Levitical cast and sentiment of the ceremonial laws in the Pentateuch, claiming, of course, that these laws were written during the exile. Dr. Kegel shows conclusively that, as he elsewhere says, "Ezekiel's reform program had not the smallest influence on the history of the Israelitish ritual."—*The Editor.*

under Zerubbabel, and later under Ezra, so few "Levites" made use of their right to return. Many of these, to be sure, in the wiser precaution of the *commendam* were opportunely smuggled in as belonging to the caste of the true priesthood, while others could not so well succeed. Thus is explained, according to Wellhausen, the large number of priests returning home under Zerubbabel and Ezra, and presto! the enigma disappears! What a vastness of unbelievableness does Wellhausen here require of his readers! The high place priests and the home-coming temple servitors evidently suffered little foreboding, as they, in spite of Ezekiel's program, returned to Jerusalem.

The note in Ezra ii. 62 sufficiently indicates what direct value was at that time attached to the legitimate descent of the members of the priesthood. Whoever could not establish this legitimacy was without further ado excluded from the office. The former high place priest must have been nothing short of foolish if, in spite of his safely large numbers, he meekly capitulated to the decision of a prophet who in other respects was demonstrably and entirely without influence. The contradiction grows in the face of the fact that Deuteronomy, the law which, according to Wellhausen, was the first to come into use, also, according to Wellhausen's assumption, gave to the high place priest a title to service in Jerusalem.

If Ezekiel was really the first to propose a difference between priest and Levite, some one of the critics will please explain how it came about that already in Babylon, before the departure of Ezra, a firmly organized association of Levites was to be found? See Ezra viii. 15 ff. Were they likely in consequence of Ezekiel's manifesto so quickly to have acted? However, we commit ourselves to deal with this absurdity, and will undertake to say freely and positively what influence we think was exerted by Ezekiel on the development of the Israelitish priesthood. And first,

and briefly, we affirm that, on the whole, *there does not exist a trace of any such influence.*

It is of historical interest to learn how Ezekiel has idealized the Israelitish hierarchical structure; however his efforts at realization, which in other things was demonstrably ineffective, had also in those cases emphasized by Wellhausen no following whatsoever. Let us take 2 Kings xxiii. 9, and on, as we have before done, and as is grammatically possible throughout, with what Ezekiel has predicated of the circumstances as developed in the Josian reformation. From these it will be clear that had the high place priests attempted to exercise the cultural office in Jerusalem, though recognized as full priests, it would have been in demonstrable contradiction of the rule.

During the exile this contradiction (service by the former high place priests) was possible of practice. In fact, in a contested sense it happened before the exile. Thus the return under Zerubbabel and Ezra of so large a number of priests as is noted in Ezra ii. 36 ff. and viii. 15 is explained, as it seems to me, upon a perfectly natural basis. In this priest body were simply included former high place priests who were of nameless Levitical parentage. Moreover, Ezekiel's memorandum (xliv. 9 ff.) does not hold absolutely against the former high place priests, who, in addition to the humiliating reduction in rank demanded, certainly were on a desperate journey without prospect of large outcome. Contrariwise, the words of Ezekiel clearly go against the idol priests, the Chemarim of 2 Kings xxiii. 5, whom manifestly Josiah had not succeeded in fully exterminating. Their fate was determined in the same way as was the fate of early heathen war prisoners. A lowly servitude in the temple became their future portion. The service rendered in the temple by those of Levitical descent is otherwise in harmony with Ezekiel's view.

Taking the matter thus, Ezekiel did not bring the high place priests to the last vestige of respect; on the

contrary, those Levites who before the exile had apostatized to actual idol service, and who had sharply transgressed against the spirit of Josiah, he treated with much gentleness, and sought to open for them a way of return to the fatherland.

With the case resting thus, much becomes understandable which, construed from Wellhausen's theorizings, is whelmed in confusion. Thus we grasp the fact that the "Levites," the so-called priests of the second order (2 Kings xxiii. 4), were only with difficulty persuaded to join in the return to Jerusalem from Babylon. They had, with so excessively numerous a company of full priests, little to hope for. If it actually happened, as Ezekiel wished, that former idol-serving priests returned with the rest, the fact is wholly unattested.

Let us now cast a brief glance at that event which, for those returning from the exile, was to be of such wide-reaching importance—namely, the religious reformation of Ezra in the year 445 B.C. as also on the times which immediately preceded and followed it. It was at this time, according to Wellhausen, that the hierarchical organization within the body of the Jewish people came to an end (when it was succeeded by tribal Leviticism). The apex of the Levitical pyramid already, in the time of Zerubbabel, was the figure of the high priest. Wellhausen boldly asserts that "the keystone of the sacred edifice which is erected in the legislation of the middle Pentateuch is the high priest. As above the Levite was elevated the Aaronite, so was Aaron himself elevated above his sons. In him centered the uniform expression of the Jewish ritual, as it was accommodated through Deuteronomy and Josiah. "A figure of such unequal sanctity," so Wellhausen affirms, "is strange to the rest of the Old Testament; Ezekiel himself knows no high priest of such eminent holiness."

Of this we have already spoken, and have explained that, because of the silence of Ezekiel regarding the high

priest, the nonexistence of that office is not in the least to be inferred. Allowing even that the prophet in other connections in his statements avoided a reference to existing facts, aside from that we have satisfactory ground on which to stand. That the high priest was unknown to preëxilian Old Testament literature is nothing short of empty assertion. Only with the help of higher criticism can anybody discount the memoranda of Israelitish history books in which the high priest is expressly mentioned, or in the sense of which his office is necessarily involved. Unassailable to the last degree are the passages in 2 Kings xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4. Fully correct and abiding are the words of von Baudissin at this point: "Under the culture personnel of the sanctuary of the regal period in Jerusalem, it went as being suitable and a matter of course that there was a difference between a first priest and the rest of the priesthood. In most cases, it is obvious that the priest of the first rank was known simply as the *kohen* (Hebrew for 'priest'). At the same time, however, Jehoiada is one time named as high priest (2 Kings xii. 11), while Hilkiah is three times so named (2 Kings xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4). Seraiah is called chief priest (*hauptpriester*) in 2 Kings xxv. 18.

As to the partisan charge that these five statements are interpolations, it must be characterized as nothing short of arbitrary. There is, in fact, no proof of such interpolation. In a later time Wiener has distinctly agreed with von Baudissin at this point in a sharp protest against Wellhausen's arbitrariness, in that throughout his argument he has produced not one proof for the assertion that the office of high priest did not exist in preëxilic times. All historical analogies speak for the existence of such a *pontifex maximus* in the days before 586 B.C. Moreover, the fact that at the time of the first return from the exile the high priest stood in high and unrestricted relation is simply not to be explained, if that office arose in the non-

ritual days of the exile. In all likelihood, Wellhausen would not have dared to concede the existence of the high place priests' office in preëxilic times had he not seen in that office a particularly brilliant show piece for the support of the correctness of his construction of Israelitish history, expecially the history of the Israelitish priesthood.

Incidentally, Wellhausen never wearies of speaking of the magnificence of the temple service at Jerusalem before the exile; but the high priest's office is not to be permitted to have existed then, because otherwise the late standing of the priest writing—with which Wellhausen's whole history construction stands or falls—one of Wellhausen's "assured fundamentals," would be dissolved! It seems to me that Wiener struck the heart of this matter when he declared: "Wellhausen's idea of the high priest is really closely bound up with his view that P represents the Israelites as a church." As to the order of the Israelitish law books, as construed by Wellhausen, it is well enough to say that, if the high priest's office arose only after the exile, then truly (if Wellhausen is right) must the author of P have been blind to the fact, and Ezra and Nehemiah dumb concerning their newly brought forward law, which so strongly emphasizes the office of the high priesthood.

The "sources," however, do not once agree with the assertion that the high priesthood came in only after the exile. Therefore, according to my assessment of its merit, the theory must be substituted, not however permitting the sources to be any longer tortured and "purged," until the theory again be happily developed and established. The fact is that an *over* priest was hereditary in Israel from primitive days and from generation to generation. When the designation "high priest" appears in the record, the fact is not more certainly established.

I support myself in this opinion not only on the part played by Eli in 1 Samuel i., etc.; nor alone on the mul-

tifariously observed fact that in the historical books of Israel the head priest is simply styled "the" priest; but to me the proof is rather found in 1 Samuel ii. 27 ff. where it is held as being self-evident that the office of the high priest had always existed in Israel. Wellhausen here trumpets forth the notion that there lies in this passage an effort to ground legitimacy for the Zadokian priesthood of the temple at Jerusalem—a "Deuteronomic coloring," so to speak.[1] Such an attempt at insertion, it seems to me, was a most thoroughly profitless task for the Zadokians, because the passage goes far beyond their case and establishes an unbroken succession in the high priestly office from Moses to Eli! The interpolator in foolish infatuation has furnished the opponents of the Zadokians with a dangerous weapon, and these same Zadokians have much occasion to pray: "The Lord protect us from our friends!"

According to Wellhausen and his school, the interpolators often, indeed most frequently, are incapable of forming a safe judgment. However, one cannot credit to them the folly which here so strongly emphasizes the legitimacy of the house of Eli, when they sought to establish the legitimacy of the priesthood of the distressed Zadokians. I see boldness of meaning for 1 Kings ii. 27 in the passage in 1 Samuel ii. 27, not an empty *vaticinum ex eventu.* I am much more of the view that this passage relates to the high priesthood of Samuel himself, and that the complete destruction of the house of Eli (1 Sam. ii. 31 ff.) was prophesied as being in a not distant time. Samuel was chiefly reared in the sanctuary and to assist in the service thereof.

---

[1] Here is a distinct example of how the higher criticism rids itself of those parts of the Old Testament which stand in the way of its theories. The student should carefully observe it. The credulity of the theological world has been a tremendous asset to the higher critic. A Zadokian origin of the Jewish priesthood (see I Kings ii. 27, 35; 1 Chronicles xxix. 22) is a feeble and pitiable feint of scholasticism.—*The Editor.*

That the tender child who boldly wore the linen ephod of a priest had naturally nothing to do with the priesthood is by Wiener, with fine humor, correctly employed against Wellhausen. A man of God foretold the going out of the house of Eli; and 1 Samuel iii., the continuation of the story, describes Samuel as the therein mentioned "faithful priest" (ii. 35) who as a child first received a revelation from God. That Samuel thereafter did not become the founder of an enduring house, to my mind, changes in no particular the fact that he was called, in the account in 1 Samuel i.–iii., as we view these chapters, to succeed Eli and to put his house completely aside.

The account in 1 Samuel i.–iii. is, as are so many others, taken from the author of the books of the Kings, except that the coinciding promise is not treated.

That the over (or high) priesthood, with its proper accompaniment of the concentration of religious worship (as also with Josiah), as it here comes to be seen, blends with our view is a fact the proof of which constantly grows. And, first, quite natural is the fact that with the first return of the high priest to Jerusalem an ecclesiastical roster was exhibited. It has always been the case that when political authority has lost respect and influence a prince of the church comes to stand in its stead. One needs only to reflect on the Romish papacy in the post-Constantinian days, or on the experience of the princes of the German church in the political interregnums of the empire in our own days. Thus the high priest then.

The high place priests appear not to have availed themselves of the favorable situation which fell to them at the time of the return under Cyrus. It is also extraordinarily strange, and until now by no one clearly explained, that at the religious reformation of Ezra, in the year 445 B.C., to which we now come somewhat nearer, the high priest retires from view.

According to Wellhausen's characteristic apprehension

of the matter, the religious reformation of Ezra has the largest possible significance as influencing the development of the priesthood amongst the Jewish people. At this time, so he thinks, there was found a method by which the office of the degraded high place priests was made palatable to them. This was done through Ezra, who legalized the difference between Zadokian and Levite, a thing which the pioneering Ezekiel had endeavored to bring about. But unfortunately, the sources, with one accord, do not agree with this opinion!

Wellhausen affirms: "The Levites of Ezra's day are the high place priests of the time of Josiah." But of such succession there is not a syllable of proof. We have indeed already affirmed that Ezra xliv. 9 f. clearly does not refer to the high place priests, but rather to the idol-serving priests of a former time. Wellhausen's premise, based on the very large number of priests returning under Zerubbabel and Ezra, can be made to hold only through an unwarranted hypothesis—namely, the assumption that most of the particular high place priests were smuggled in under the name of Zadokians. Ezra's effort to make their new office "palatable" to the generation of high place priests was also quite unfortunate, since from Nehemiah xii. 27 it is quite clear that the Levites themselves were found to have had manifestly little taste for the service to which they were assigned!

According to our mind, the variously denominated groups of temple-serving persons which are named in connection with the return under Zerubbabel—priests, Levites, singers, doorkeepers, temple servitors[1]—were before collectively in existence, only insignificant interior differences appearing. Levites, those who appertained to the tribe of Levi, who performed only the lesser offices of the priesthood, appear in comparatively small numbers

[1] Ezra ii.

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

before the exile. In Babylon these had found favorable conditions of life, and felt little inclination to return to the homeland. According to our view, the many particular Jehovah high place priests were classified with these. At all events, Ezra had a great interest in them; that is shown us, once for all, in the pains which he took to bring them to participate in his journey (Ezek. viii. 15 ff.), and also by the register to which they were assigned in the binding of the people to the law. Whether with Zerubbabel or with Ezra the remainder of the old Chemarim (2 Kings xxiii. 5) returned, we know as little as we can gather from the register who of the servitors of the temple of Levitical standing are included as singers, doorkeepers, and temple janitors. This last difficulty is, moreover, thoroughly conceivable.

The reform of Ezra, indeed, as Koberle correctly affirms, stands not in the interest of the hierarchy, but rather in the interest of the law. A new member in the precedence of the temple personnel was, however, not created by Ezra. Had Ezra, as is to-day commonly assumed, brought forward as something new the priest code which had its standing in the Babylonian exile (glance at Numbers xviii. 4), it is incomprehensible that he should have had patience with the Nethenim, the folk stranger temple servitors of a former day. Were there over against Numbers xviii. 4 an old utterance, which early was certainly ignored (Ezek. xliv. 6 f.), one could the more easily understand why Ezra at this point did not act so energetically as is otherwise his habit. His reform is of significant influence on the different groups of temple personals only so far as follows from its self-explained terminology. Before the exile the full priests were often included under the collective designation, "sons of Levi," which form is much more generally used after the exile.

When Ezra speaks in his memoirs of Levites, by that expression is meant only those members of the tribe of

Levi of whom the highest priestly genuineness might be affirmed. When the certainly post-exilic Malachi speaks of Levi as "the representative of the priesthood," he shows that the old proof expression had not fully passed away.

In conclusion, let us cast a glance at the chronicler, who in the books of the Chronicles, and in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, exhibits his authorship; and who reveals to us the religious situation in the century following the reform of Ezra. From him it shall be confirmed to us that the interior relationships of the religious personnel at Jerusalem was simple enough at this time. He appropriately distinguishes between priests and Levites. Thus finally we are prepared to deal with the particular priest status then, and also as it existed before the exile. These particular priests, with the singers and doorkeepers, from whom, as we have seen,[1] they were separated, more and more melted into a group (2 Chron. xxiii. 4; xxxv. 15). The singers and doorkeepers thereby naturally won respect. Of the primitive threefold division of the personnel of the priesthood there now remains scarcely a trace, though the reader is requested to consult 2 Chronicles viii. 14. What Ezra pioneered when he assigned to the Levites so strong a part in the religious reformation was probably at last self-fulfilled. The inferior temple personnel that with the so-called "priests of the second order" (2 Kings xxiii. 4) was in the time of the Chronicler more and more builded into a uniformity, was socially uplifted, though between it and the particular priesthood there stood a sharp distinction. Also the Chronicler employed, as did Malachi, the expression "Levite" (2 Chron. xxix. 5) yet so that the whole religious personnel should stand with the covering in of the full priesthood, and thereby prove

[1]See Ezra ii.; Nehemiah vii.

the old tradition, that priests and Levites went back to a common racial origin (2 Chron. xi. 14).

Looking from the standpoint of Wellhausen—namely, that only after Ezra the code of the priests had validity—the racial unity of the priesthood becomes impossible. Wellhausen's contention would also leave fully in question all the privileges for which the priests in Jerusalem so laboriously fought. So it is that the risks taken by the critics on these questions are clearly a multitude.

The naïve air of security with which most of Wellhausen's hypotheses are given out as proven facts, and with which he makes contention in Old Testament theology, is, to say the least, for his scheme of the history of the Israelitish priesthood abundantly out of proportion. To illustrate, I have before called attention to the "stumps and stones" which lie in the way, which, as Wellhausen sees it, is everywhere a path of smoothness. These stumps and stones appear to me to make the whole road an impossible one.

The challenge is, therefore, unmistakable: A new way must be opened, if we would at any time reach a happy goal! The difficulties which lie in this way must not simply be oversprung or removed by help of dialectical denial; they must rather be dissolved by patient and untiring labor. If this is not done, then the newly laid path will itself be a way of error, and once again must the work of road-building be begun, until finally there shall be found elucidation of all the obscurities of tradition. However, so long as Old Testament science moves on the doubtful path laid by Wellhausen we need not wonder if scholars like Delitzsch with equal confidence should lay open an equally unsafe way.

The "history of the Israelitish priesthood," and first quite naturally the "history of Israel," need no more be construed in a haphazard fashion: but it must rather be worked out slowly, step by step. Indeed, I hold this proc-

ess as most desirable, if the history books and law writings of the Old Testament must again through force be separated one from the other by the frivolous wrong inferences of present-day handling.

Wellhausen says once more: "With the recognized steps in the strata of the development of the Pentateuch standing in parallel columns, success is easy." According to my judgment, the source of all critical error lies just here.[1] With Wellhausen, sophistry frequently couples itself with sophistry. In this essay I have scarcely entered upon the grounds of Pentateuchal interpretation. But I must observe that the Hegelian *a priori* method has worked sadly in the Old Testament science of our day. I cannot better express what is in my mind than briefly in the style of the New Testament to say: "Hegel begat Vatke; Vatke begat Wellhausen; Wellhausen begat Delitzsch; and Delitzsch is the gravedigger of the method which Hegel introduced for the handling of the history of Israel."

It is no accident that in the introduction to his writing, "The Great Deception," Delitzsch bowed obsequiously to Wellhausen. He knew, and must finally admit, from whom and through whom his "method" was learned. Also, when Old Testament science shall have finally won against Delitzsch and his unheard-of war on the integrity of the Hebrew Scriptures, he shall contemplate the error of Wellhausen which he has adopted and say: "*Mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.*" Then, however toilful may seem a new and unobjectionable method for handling the problem of Bible history, the result cannot be wanting.

---

[1] Higher criticism has reached the climax of arrogance in the parallel column exhibit of "sources." It is a sand fort against traditional truth, but a pitfall to personal faith in the Scriptures.—*The Editor.*

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Part I

Number 3

The Religious Reformation of Ezra

By

MARTIN KEGEL, Lic.Thl., Ph.D.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1923

THE AFTERMATH SERIES.---Part I

Number 1.—"The Crisis of Criticism," by the Editor.

Number 2.—"The History of the Israelitish Priesthood," by Martin Kegel, Ph.D., Student Lecturer, Joachimstal Gymnasium, Templin; also late Inspector at the Theological Seminar, Wittenberg, Germany. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 3.—"The Religious Reformation of Ezra," by Martin Kegel, Lic.Thl., Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER THREE.

The Religious Reformation of Ezra.

BY MARTIN KEGEL, LIC.THL., PH.D.

With Introduction by the Editor.

(85)

III.

INTRODUCTION.

Appraisement of the stories of Josiah and Ezra as determinative and decisive points in the history of the Israelitish people and their law has gone before in this series. The tremendous historical value of the records left by these ancient leaders is, however, quite matched by their importance as the data of a spiritual ethic which first expressed itself in Jewish faith and then more completely in the faith of Christianity. The religious movements which marked the ages of Josiah and Ezra have generally been spoken of as reformations, and reformations they indeed were, but much more. The exterior view of the work of both Josiah and Ezra exhibits a series of reforms in religious observances and conduct; but an even deeper spiritual power operates beneath the surface. These movements were pronounced revivals, flowing from the fountains of emotion, conviction, and soul hunger in the life of a whole people. It is in relation to this revivalistic quality that these movements are most logically expounded; and it is in this relation that they most effectively testify against the attacks of that modern criticism which has sought to invalidate the integrity of their historic claims.

Revivals are the logical accompaniments of the proclamation of the message and law of God, as these are reaffirmed in the spirit of a true prophecy. The revivals under Josiah and Ezra came of the republished law, republished under conditions of national stress. It is this fact that criticism will never be able to overturn. It is the element in our modern-day religion which shall more than prevail against pragmatism and destructivism.

But there is a polemic which befits even the most spiritual statement of religion. Unfriendly criticism must be met and redress of its injustice taken through the mili-

tancy of its own weapons. The defense of religious truth, and especially of the records which guarantee its continued manifestation, must be defended with courage, alertness, and intelligent zeal.

The two ancient revivals referred to above, which really involve the final proof of the historical integrity of the Old Testament Scriptures, are to be the subjects of study in the present number of the "Aftermath Series." Of these two historical revivals of the ethical and spiritual consciousness of a nation, that of Ezra is the more distinctly marked, and is also more far-reaching in its consequences, having definitely put Jewish religious thought in its last stages of advance toward the day of Messiah. But though this is true, it is not easy to grasp fully the significance of the Ezraic reformation without a previous study of the work of Josiah.

In this Introduction, I am attempting, in the briefest possible way, to conduct such a study, leaving a larger treatment of the event for a future number of this series, when it will find a place in the matter brought forward for validating the canon. What I am now proceeding to say is in the way of prefacing the very able presentation of the Ezraic reformation by Dr. Kegel, who has also published a notable work on the "Religious Reformation of Josiah." We do not hesitate to speak of these two contributions to the literature of criticism as containing a corrective norm out of which is destined to come a restored reverence and true understanding of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the Old Testament. The form of Dr. Kegel's work on Ezra which follows is an abridgment of his volume published in Germany. The Editor has carefully studied this larger work, and has sought to give to the readers of this series a full but convenient view of his arguments.[1]

[1] I am indebted to the Rev. J. A. Rabe for valuable help in the translation of the larger volume.—*The Editor.*

At the time of the Josian reformation, the Israelitish priesthood existed in the recognized headship of a high priest, a body of Levitical priests, many of whom, through stress of the times, were scattered throughout the kingdom of Judah, practicing the irregular Jehovah high place cult —that is, sacrificing in the name of Jehovah at unauthorized altars. Some had gone into the service of idols. This, according to the plain Bible account, was the religious situation and the order of the religious office at the beginning of the Josian reform.

But at the outset, a conservative and constructive student is confronted with a flat denial by the critics of the integrity of the historical books of the Old Testament, and especially of those that deal particularly with the history of the priesthood. This has its embarrassments; but the earnest-minded investigator should be assured that the Levitical priesthood is too strongly grounded in its historical character to be outlawed in this fashion.

And now, I ask the student reader to consider this: How does it happen that the historical and prophetical books of the Old Testament, written, as the critics say, by a multiplicity of authors, redactors, and *diaskeuasts* (and the tendency of criticism is to increase the number) covering a period of four hundred years, yet exhibit a cloud of witnesses in practical unity as to the history long existence of the Levitical priesthood in Israel, and its Mosaic origin? If in the book of Judges there is found (which I, for one, deny) a measure of evidence, from silence and irregularity, which would weigh against the historicity of the Levitical priesthood, it is of too little consequence to be used in impeaching the integrity of the entire Old Testament canon. But of however much moment a matter of the canonical integrity of the Scriptures may seem to the more reverent student, it means nothing to the average higher critic. The invalidation of the Levitical priesthood is his necessity. As to where that will lead, must seem to

him of small consequence. It is an axiom of the advanced school that the doctrine of inspiration, as also the letter of scriptural claims, cannot stand in the way of critical science. The testimony of the Son of Man to these claims is no more than that of a common scribe. This is the schoolmaster with an iron ferrule to whom not a few of our theological brethren would deliver us. But our prayer is for a counter deliverance!

Take together the books of Joshua, Judges, and 1 Samuel, or even the estimate accorded them by the critics, and their testimony from the time of the crossing of the Jordan by Joshua to the time of Samuel will lead an unbiased mind inevitably to the conclusion that there existed in Israel, during all this time, an established priesthood of some recognized status. The few cases of personal sacrifice offering exhibited during that time, under exceptional conditions, do not in any wise distress the case. The one example of irregular priesthood, that of Micah's son (which was clearly unauthorized, and even idolatrous), is, on its face, *ultra vires*, and must be ruled out.

That an elaborate ritual and sacrifice service were maintained in the temple of Solomon, which continued to exist to the time of Josiah, is provable from sources extraneous to canonical Israelitish records. That such a service required a hierarchical as well as a subsidiary priesthood of large and ever-replenished personnel, is beyond a hazard of conjecture. The remains of the temple themselves bear a mute testimony. The amazing size of the basic stones, and the ascertained extent of the walls of Solomon's temple, point to an unparalleled sacerdotalism which flourished there through the centuries. The priesthood of such an establishment must have been an *order:* it could not have been recruited and maintained haphazard: its succession must have been hereditary and continuously preparational. Some such scheme as that of tribal Levitism was absolutely necessary. This consideration alone

puts the Levitical priesthood upon a more certain basis of history and heredity than can be claimed for the patrician lineage of Rome, or the Norman genealogies of England.

A more than mystical relationship, recognized by both the Old and the New Testaments, subsists between the Levitical priesthood, particularly the Aaronic high priesthood, and the priesthood of Salem, of which Melchizedek is the only known representative. It is fair to assume that this Melchizedek was one of an order of priests. The Salem priesthood became the norm of the monotheistic priesthood of the Hebrews. The relation is not that of identity, but of likeness and antecedency. In the course of its cycles, the Hebrew priesthood returned for its perfect historical and prophetic fulfillment to the ancient seat at Salem (Jerusalem). The force of this is to greatly extend the background and record of the Hebrew priesthood. It was no afterthought or accident.

When then, in the time of Josiah, a status is claimed for the Aaronic high priesthood, and for the Levitical priesthood in its orders, although the critics stigmatize and outlaw the record, the situation is written over with verisimilitude and fact. The house of false conclusions erected by destructive criticism is destined to be pulled down upon its own head.

The tabernacle and the ark of the covenant are the correlatives of the Levitical priesthood. The wilderness existence of these has been denied, and their origin ascribed to the times of the Judges. The ark is alleged to have been made in imitation of the pagan Canaanites who carried an incantation box before their armies into war. Of this, however, there is no evidence outside of a fertile scholastic fancy. Since the time of Wilhelm Vatke it has been strongly urged that both the tabernacle and the ark were of a manner of workmanship too intricate and technical to have been constructed in the time of Moses. The contents of

the recently discovered tomb of King Tut-ankh-amen in Egypt sweep that objection away.

In the time of Josiah the temple was the successor of the tabernacle, but the ark of the wilderness days still may well have been in existence, as indeed the record shows. It may have had a close connection with the law book of the Hilkiah-Josiah history. The Pentateuch informs us that, under the direction of Moses, a law book was deposited in the sides of the ark. In his work on "Wilhelm Vatke and the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis" Dr. Kegel says: "One of the fundamental questions of Old Testament literary criticism about the middle of the nineteenth century was a question concerning the law book discovered during the time of Josiah." Wellhausen is sure that this book was one and the same with our Deuteronomy, and that it was fabricated out of hand by Hilkiah and his confederates. Vatke is equally certain that it was not the same: but that the Josiah code was yet the substance of a very old legislation, and identifies it largely with the legal contents of Exodus, citing a number of sections in that book.

The natural inference of tradition has been that the Josiah code was the whole Mosaic law, or that it was that particular body of the law which had been placed in the side of the ark. The supposition that it contained the whole Mosaic legislation has obvious difficulties, since it is doubtful if even at the time of Josiah the whole legal code existed in a single volume. That the Josiah book was an extensive work, there can be no doubt; and it is evident that in the long reading before the king, those parts which had special bearing upon the existing state of worship and the character of the priests as the guides of the people most impressed him. This could be accounted for only on the supposition that these made appeal to a previous knowledge of the king concerning the things read. To have produced the reported effect, the law must have covered an old and previously recognized, but sometime neglected, obligation.

If our view of the status of the priesthood be correct, and it is unassailable from outside logic, then the book of Josiah was an ancient code, temporarily lost, or unused, but recovered at a crucial national juncture. If this code was an old one, then the Levitical priesthood was equally old.

Speaking from personal judgment, I should say that the argument is in favor of the Josiah code being practically identical with the present book of Deuteronomy. That the two arch critics, Vatke and Wellhausen, are so far apart in the matter takes from the contention something of its critical incentive. The book agrees with itself, however much the critics disagree.

One of the things which is apparent in the history of Israelitish literature, and which traditional Old Testament science admits, is that the books of the Pentateuch passed through an editorial treatment and putting together, in the process of being settled in the canon. It would seem that the time of Ezra, or near thereto, best accounts for this process. The legislation and historical books of Moses are exhibited in this arrangement. The editorial notes and *nexi* which, now and again, give an anachronistic suggestion to the history are comparatively unimportant, and do not change the ground upon which a Mosaic and ancient origin is claimed for the books as a whole. The editors were inspired equally with the original writers. And again, I add, if the very many hands which criticism alleges were laid to the task of making the Israelitish record, the marvel is that the Israelitish priesthood shows such history long solidarity. The traditional view alone can explain this.

THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION OF EZRA.

THE importance of chapters viii. to x. of the book of Nehemiah to a proper understanding of the history of Israelitish literature and religion is at once obvious. The attitude which one is forced to assume toward great portions of the legal, historical, and prophetic writings of the Old Testament depends upon the results one obtains from these chapters. They therefore demand a particularly searching investigation, an investigation taken with the greatest purpose of objectivity and without prejudice. In making an investigation of this kind, one must not be influenced by the "assured results" of modern critical science nor intimidated by childish ridicule. If such investigation leads us to results not in accord with the views that obtain in our day in regard to the development of the history of Israelitish literature and religion, this does not prove that our conclusions are based on false premises. May it not be true, on the other hand, that many of the views of our day are erroneous because they are gained from the wrong viewpoint?

Of course if the prevalent critical views with reference to Nehemiah viii.–x. are proven to be erroneous, even in part, we will be met by the objection that details do not signify much. But there are details upon which everything depends, because they are, as it were, the foundations which uphold the entire structure! A "detail" of this kind we find in 2 Kings xxii., and in those chapters which follow, respecting the history of the literature and religion of the Jews. Another such "detail" is formed by chapters viii.–x. of the book of Nehemiah. He who can successfully prove that these "details" are to-day being generally falsely received and wrongly applied, will show that current Old Testament criticism, especially that of the Pentateuch, is

dilapidated and must make room for a new structure having a more solid foundation than the present cracked and broken exhibit of the so-called "historico-critical school." Upon the whole, the words of Klostermann may be allowed to stand as valid: "The problem of the Pentateuch is not a single knot that can be unraveled by a single dexterous turn of the hand, but a whole tangle of knots, each one requiring a particular point of view and a particular treatment."

In order to untangle the knot which is presented by chapters viii.–x. of Nehemiah, it is not necessary to enter upon everything which has been written concerning them. The number of such is legion. Certain assertions, for the test, do not merit the trouble of refutation, as, for instance, the one that Ezra was but an ideal figure, a creation of priestly theory and imagination. I agree with Eduard Meyer that "in the case of a document handed down to us from historic times, the burden of proof rests with those who attack its genuineness, and not with its defenders." But the arguments adduced for the non-historicity of the person of Ezra and the book of Nehemiah are exceedingly flimsy. They are no more weighty than those brought forward about the middle of the nineteenth century by Bruno Bauer against the historicity of Jesus and the chief of the apostles.

For the record of Nehemiah viii.–x., we proceed from the Masora; for, more and more, we gain the conviction that "our Masoretic text was handed down to us through comparatively good sources." The LXX, upon which we must draw to obtain the probable original text, side by side with the complete Greek text of our books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which it contains, reproduces the matter of these two books in a revision, which is designated as the Third Book of Ezra (See Apochrypha). Opinions regarding the value of the Third Book of Ezra are much divided. We must guard against arbitrariness; but some investigators create

the impression that they attach importance to the LXX versions only when they agree with their hypotheses.

Our textual discussion must begin with Nehemiah vii. 73, for "the second half of the verse is intimately connected with chapter viii. and should be attached to it." In the LXX, the last two sentences of vii. 73 go to the chapter following. Taking it all in all, we may say that the text of the section from Nehemiah vii. 73 to Nehemiah x. 40 offers comparatively few points that can be objected to.

If these three chapters (vii. 73–x. 40) had come down to us separately, we should first have to examine them as to their homogeneity and unity. We should find that they treat of one fact—that is to say, of the reading of the law and the obligations growing out of the same; that as to style, they are thoroughly fitted together, although the long, eloquent prayer leaves somewhat "the sober style of the reporter"; that they are held together by definite expressions; that the notice in ix. 1 ("on the twenty-fourth day of the same month") smoothly connects itself with what is related before; and, finally, that the law, whose obligations were assumed, is designated by the same turns of language as is the corpus mentioned in Nehemiah viii. 1.

As is well known, the account of Nehemiah viii.–x. is found in the midst of a work of considerable size (Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, which only for practical reasons was divided into several parts). That this great work was not written by one author at one time, but that this author in gathering material for his history has drawn upon sources must be concluded, particularly in regard to the second part of the work (Ezra, Nehemiah), for the reason that the events are simply reported, and for the further reason that those who participate speak in the first person. The author of the entire work (without any good reason, placed by some in a late period of time) has worked up written subject

matter, and the question naturally arises: Was our section, Nehemiah viii.–x., written by the chronicler, the author of the work, or were its constituent parts respectively derived from other sources? In order to determine this, we do not proceed from linguistic observations or those of style, but seek, first, to determine how our section is related to its nearest environments. Nehemiah i. 1–vii. 3 contains an account of Nehemiah's visit to Jerusalem, and especially concerning the measures which he there took for the rebuilding of the wall. The whole section is kept so intuitive and personal that there is left no room for doubt that Nehemiah is himself guiding the pen.

When we consider the three chapters (vii. 73–x. 40) as detached from their present environment, we find that the impression is overwhelmingly strong that we have in them portions of sources entirely homogeneous. One event stands controllingly in its very middle—the reading of the law by Ezra and the obligating of the people to the same. During the last few decades, however, the assertion has frequently been made that the three chapters are treating of two different things, and had not originally been connected with each other, as now. In this connection, Kosters has accomplished truly incredible things in the way of assertions, upon which we here enter somewhat fully. In Kosters' opinion, the whole tradition presents a picture of complete confusion. Some of his theses are as follows: A return of exiles under Cyrus did not take place at all. The attempt to rebuild the temple emanated, on the contrary, from the Palestinian Jews. Ezra first brought back a large number of exiles. These united with the Palestinian Jews. Thus first the "congregation" was formed. Nor did Ezra appear in Jerusalem before Nehemiah, but after him: we must place his activity in the time of the second stay of Nehemiah at Jerusalem.

After having cut out the beginning of the account in

chapter viii., Kosters considers the beginning of chapter ix. as worked over. The chapter, he says, "has little clearness"; the chronology "has been smuggled in." No wonder that, after beheading it, he finds the account "headless." That is generally the case at executions!

Now, how may we imagine the section Nehemiah viii.–x. to have originated, and how did it come to be admitted into the greater work, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah? That in our so named books Ezra and Nehemiah there are portions that had Ezra and Nehemiah as their direct authors there can be no doubt. The use of the personal pronoun "I" in several parts of the narrative, the vividness of description, and many other things make this a certainty. Those who, as we do, consider Nehemiah vii. 73–x. 40 as homogeneous and belonging together, are convinced that in Nehemiah viii.–x. we are dealing with a portion of the memoirs of Ezra. The fact that in Nehemiah 8 f. the first personal pronoun is not used is explained in the fact that this section had already found a place in the "Book of Daily Events" (Nehemiah xii. 23), which probably narrated the events in reporter style before the chronicler incorporated it into his work.

We will now adduce the reasons which lead us to believe that Ezra is the author of the section in question, Nehemiah viii.–x. And, first, the negative reasons. If the chronicler had invented the narrative in question, much of what we find in it would appear different. For instance, we would expect him to show a strong coöperation on the part of the high priest. Then Geiszler convincingly has shown that the parts of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah which are most probably parts of the memoirs of Ezra contain idiomatic peculiarites in great numbers which are contrary to the author of the greater work. We must therefore, from this side, disallow the idea that the chronicler has written Nehemiah viii.–x.

Then the positive reasons. The chapters in question

describe the details of events with such exactness as that we may with certainty assume the author to have been an eyewitness of the same. Steuernagel has correctly called attention to the fact that Ezra, who has described, in Ezra vii., how he was empowered to introduce the law, must necessarily also have recorded in what manner he carried out his commission. Whether or not the chronicler knew the memorabilia of Nehemiah in its original form, we will not venture to decide. Still we believe, following especially the arguments of Eduard Meyer, that we can assert that he found the section, as we read it to-day in Nehemiah i. 1–x. 40, in its entirety in the "Book of Daily Events."

Fortunately, the chronicler is well known to us, since we have before us his great work, and since we are frequently able to observe his method, for instance, in the book of Kings. Judgment concerning him, however, has fluctuated during recent decades. Some critics have declared him to be a thoroughly tendential writer. Wellhausen, particularly, has not missed an opportunity to sneer at his inferiority, his stupidity, coupled with artifice. But Wellhausen, in his eagerness to disparage the chronicler, does not notice how distinctly comical and grotesque his own performances appear to the reader.[1]

Among the arbitrary statements which clearly show what can be made out of an account with the help of so-called science, until it contains what it should contain (that is, what the critics desire), the constant critical allusions to the repeated bringing in of the Levites by the chronicler deserve strong notice. The verses 4b, 7, 8, 11,

---

[1]We desire especially to impress upon the minds of our younger theological readers the fact here brought out by Dr. Kegel—namely, the spirit of irreverent trifling and truculent partisanship employed by the very chiefest of the critics in dealing with the records of the Old Testament. A boastful show of argument and *a priori* deduction is employed where the way is easy, but when the record opposes, then the divine writers come in for scandal and beheading.—*The Editor.*

12b are attributed by not a few investigators to the chronicler. But in spite of the well-known predilection of the chronicler for the Levites, it is necessary to be very cautious in dealing with this particular. It surely cannot be denied that Ezra also took a lively interest in the Levites. Why then should he not have permitted them to participate in the promulgation of the law?

Except with reference to viii. 9, it only remains to point to verses 17 and 18, which, according to Hoelscher, "sound chronistical." It is true that viii. 17 reminds one strongly of 2 Kings xxiii. 23; but does not such a look backward measure so brief a time that its objective might have been found in the original account? Obviously, did not Ezra copy the whole act of the reading of the law, and the assuming of its obligations by the people, after the event narrated in 2 Kings xxii., etc.? Would it not then have come to him naturally to refer to that suggestive account in his narrative?

In Nehemiah vii. 73b–x. 40 we possess, as has been shown, a connected narrative which had its origin, most probably, in the memoirs of Ezra, which, however, before it had been incorporated with our work Chronicles+Ezra+Nehemiah, had probably been found in another work, the "Book of Daily Events." Now what is told us in these three chapters does not by any means produce an impression of incredibility. On the contrary. Even Wellhausen, at one place, says: "The credibility of the actual contents of the narrative (which he, to be sure, holds to have been worked over by the chronicler) carries its own evidence." But we must put into proper relation to the political world conditions of those days what has been related in Nehemiah viii.–x. and must consider whether the account itself contains any contradictions.

In the first place, we may consider as adequately proven that Cyrus (in 583 B.C.) gave permission to the Jews to return to their own country. The Jews actually returned

under Cyrus. As is well known, Eduard Meyer has vigorously defended the genuineness of the Aramaic copy of the edict of Cyrus restoring the Jews to their country (See Ezra i., ii., iv.). It so happened that the discovery of Aramaic documents in Elephantine brilliantly confirmed his conclusions! Cyrus, in granting this permission to the Jews, pursued a policy followed by his successors, as has been sufficiently proven. We learn from Egypt and other lands that the Persian kings leaned on religion in their politics throughout, that they built temples and brought sacrifices. It is entirely within the domain of this policy that we are told in our canonical book of Ezra that King Artaxerxes had permitted the priest Ezra to return to Palestine with a caravan and to introduce a book of laws sanctioned by the Persian king.

As is known, there are three Persian kings of the name of Artaxerxes, in order as follows: Artaxerxes I. (Longimanus, 465–424 B.C.), Artaxerxes II. (Mnemon, 405–362), and Artaxerxes III. (Ochus, 362–338). The last named need not be seriously considered by us as a contemporary of Ezra, as we shall discuss later. Our choice really lies between the first two of the kings of this name. For the present, let us hold in abeyance the answer to the question, which of the two kings is meant, and let us rather consider whether the firman which granted permission to Ezra to return home (Ezra vii. 12 f.) is to be considered as genuine or fictitious. Many arguments have been marshaled against it; for instance, the perfect familiarity of the Persian king with the customs and religious institutions of the Jews, the various specifically Jewish turns in the writing, the high aids that were to be given by "all the treasurers in Syria" upon command of the king to Ezra, etc. But all these arguments, as they have also been adduced by Cheyne ("The Religious Life of the Jews after the Exile"), are not convincing. If, as Eduard Meyer, the most zealous defender of the genuineness of the firman, supposes,

the sketch for the royal edict had been written by Ezra himself and submitted to the royal council, then all these objections at once fall to the ground. But if the firman is genuine, as many investigators in our day assume, then it is certain that Ezra started upon his expedition to Palestine with a book of the law in his hands, with whose introduction in his own country he had been intrusted; a fact which is of course of the greatest importance for our section, Nehemiah viii.–x., *which treats of the sanctioning of a book of the law.*

If Ezra's expedition took place under Artaxerxes I. (we left this question open), then it falls upon the year 458 (457); if it took place under Artaxerxes II., there would remain only the year 398 (397); for that the expedition of Ezra took place in the seventh year of some Artaxerxes is beyond all doubt, according to Ezra vii. 7 f. In vain this chronology has been violently assailed. It is the only exact date contained in the memoirs of Ezra.

The date of Ezra vii. 7 f., for whose invention by a later writer nobody has ever produced an argument, makes it appear as certain that Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in the seventh year of the reign of a certain King Artaxerxes.

Equally incontestable with the date of Ezra vii. 5 f. are the notices in the memoirs of Ezra that Nehemiah received authority to lead an expedition to Palestine in the twentieth year of an Artaxerxes. (cf. Neh. ii. 1), and that in the thirty-second year of the same Artaxerxes he proceeded to Shushan, only to return soon thereafter to Jerusalem as governor (cf. xiii. 6 f.). Since it "may be assumed with certainty that the King Artaxerxes of the memoirs of *Nehemiah* is the first king of this name, who ruled from 465–424," it will be necessary, first of all, to determine *the temporal relation of Ezra to Nehemiah*, in order to decide whether Ezra too had worked under this king. The tradition in the form of our books of Ezra and Nehemiah assumes that Ezra arrived in Jerusalem *before* Nehemiah. But it may

be possible that Ezra arrived in his country with his gola during the time in which Nehemiah was again sojourning in Babylon, after his first stay in Jerusalem.

We must therefore conclude that the statement of the cultural reform of Ezra, as we find it in Nehemiah viii.–x., thoroughly fits into the political conditions of that time, that it only corroborates what we find in extra-Biblical sources also, that the Persians liked to make use of the religion of their subjects for political aims of a subordinate kind. Our statement has furthermore clearly shown that the narrative in Nehemiah viii.–x. does not in itself contain any contradictions or incredible statements: everything moves on the plane of sober reality! So, then, we may see in the account in Nehemiah viii.–x. "a most valuable, fully authentic tradition." Or, let us say with greater reserve: "Historically, it is entirely probable" that in the first year of Nehemiah's term as governor—*i. e.*, in the month Tishri, of the year 445—a Jewish law, authenticated by the ruling king, was read by Ezra and was officially adopted. "Upon the statement that the increase of the population of Jerusalem is to be made the subject of discussion, the nobles and the people were called together; but in this assembly the motion is made to read and introduce the law."

It is natural that we should look about us in the literature of Israel, so far as we still possess it, for some notices which can be made to relate to the reformation of Ezra, and that we should try to throw some light upon the *chiaroscuro* that envelops it. For the elucidation of our subject, we might properly consider principally portions from the prophetic literature, say, Isaiah and Jeremiah, portions concerning which it is asserted that they had been falsely attributed to these prophets, but in reality belong to later days. How in the world have such conclusions been arrived at? Two instances may elucidate this. When, as it may happen, we find in the prophet Jeremiah a high estimation of the Sabbath, many scholars relegate such a

passage to a later time, and refuse to ascribe it to the prophet, principally because such a valuation of the Sabbath could not have been possible until *after* the introduction of the code of the priests by Ezra, which by many investigators is now considered as dogma.[1] *We*, however, desire, first of all, to consider the question, Which book, and whether a recently written book, like the code of the priests, had been published at all by Ezra? Or we may refer to the so-called "Trito-Isaiah," whose existence has also in no small degree been disclosed by the affinity of ideas of Isaiah lvi.–lxvi. with the priesthood.

Let us make a beginning with Ezekiel, whose activity, it is true, found play more than a century before Ezra's cultural reform. He is most generally produced as crown's witness for the claim that Levitical tendencies had been formed by the Jews in exile, which later found their culmination in the work of Ezra. Let us hear what Wellhausen has to say: "Ezekiel pursued the course to which the times pointed. He is the middle connecting link between prophecy and the law. He professes to be a prophet; he proceeds, indeed, from prophetic thoughts; but they are not his own, but those of his predecessors, whom he dogmatizes. By nature he is a priest, and his most peculiar merit consists in having inclosed the soul of prophecy in the body of a political commonwealth, based upon the cult and the temple. Chapters xl.–xlviii. are the most important ones of his book."

As may easily be understood, it is very unpleasant to many critics that only the *one* Ezekiel can be mentioned by name by them as forerunner of the reform of Ezra, "as

[1]The critical treatment of the doctrine and history of the Sabbath is one of the most certain manifests of pragmatism in the whole higher critical school. The antiquity of the origin and law of the Sabbath is abundantly attested both without and by the Scriptures, and yet it serves the critics to make it a *Jewish* and not a *Hebrew* institution.—*The Editor.*

they conceive it," and that his testimony has so little weight—that is, to those critics who believe that in the code of Ezra a product of learned Jewish circles has come to light. Ezekiel himself is no evidence that in the exile certain laws had been fabricated, intended for future practical use. His statements (chapters xl.–xlviii.) of his prophecy must not be torn from the visionary atmosphere of the ending and utilized as a practical program, emanating from the reformatory zeal of the priests. But that a reformation in the cultic sphere, such as Ezra subsequently translated into deeds, was already in preparation during the exile; that, upon the whole, diligent efforts were made toward its realization, especially in Babylon, we believe to be able to make credible in still *another* manner. In respect to chapters xvii.–xxvi. of Leviticus, it is now widely supposed that they were created in those days. Wellhausen, as well as Kautzsch, to name only two of the well-known champions of this almost universally disseminated assumption, express themselves very confidently. The former says: "It appears certain to me that our author lived either near the close of the Babylonian exile, or after the same, inasmuch as toward the close he has in view the restitution." The latter says: "At all events, the whole corpus received its present stamp by a hand which stood in the closest possible relation to the author or authors of P." In the limits of this treatise we cannot discuss the question of the time when the law of holiness was created. But I have already shown it to be highly probable that the statements of the so-called law of holiness already belonged to the code of Hilkiah, and agree with Klostermann when he says: "Thus all facts, and the considerations growing out of them, unite in the result that the law of holiness formed an authoritative document in the opinion of Ezekiel and his contemporaries concerning the will of God as it was recognized by Israel since the time of Moses, which, having come down by tradition long since, now found under new cir-

cumstances susceptible hearts as to its ethical parts, and proved its ancient power." Klostermann's demonstration that Ezekiel and his hearers knew and had in their minds the law of holiness is highly significant. A drawing up of this law in Babylon is, therefore, not to be thought of.[1]

That chapters xl.–xlv. of Isaiah betray all but "a Levitic spirit" is well known. But that chapters lvi.–lxvi. of Isaiah can render the origin of P during the exile particularly probable, indeed, that light of any kind can be thrown by them on the cultural reform of Ezra, I cannot in any event admit.

Haggai and Zechariah are, it is true, in a certain way, direct forerunners of the efforts of Ezra and Nehemiah in the cultural domain. But nowhere do we find in them the faintest reference to the necessity for beginning the construction of a new law. To me, Haggai especially seems to exclude the thought that in his day, or soon thereafter, any one could have hoped to find favor with the religiously very indifferent people with a newly constructed law. Haller says, referring to Haggai ii. 10–19: "It is noticeable that the Torah in the time of Haggai was still living—*i. e.*, made use of freely by the priests."

We may ask ourselves, after what Haller here says, whether it is probable that the Jerusalem priesthood, which had been accustomed to "draw from the Torah freely," would have allowed themselves to be talked into the acceptance of a law just recently constructed in Babylon (and that such an one as the majority of scholars conceive the code of Ezra to have been), without protest. Still less benefit would in those days have been expected from new books of the law than from old ones; for, strange to say, neither in Haggai nor in Zechariah do we find a distinct reference to the law book of Josiah, which in 620

[1] The so-called law of holiness extends from Leviticus xvii. to xxvi. inclusive. The reasons urged for separating it from other sections of the law are insufficient.—*The Editor.*

was solemnly accepted by the people. So then: That Haggai and Zechariah attach high importance to matters pertaining to the cult undoubtedly creates between them and Ezra and Nehemiah a number of *connecting links;* but neither the one nor the other can be made available as witness for the preparation of a new cultural law!

Somewhat more explicitly we must now enter upon the consideration of the last prophetic writing of our canon—the little book of *Malachi.* While it was believed formerly that this writing had behind it the activities of Ezra, Stade, in particular, has attempted to prove that the relation of Malachi to Ezra was just the reverse. To-day this view is generally accepted, and it is thought that the book originated immediately before the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, about 460 before Christ. This may indeed be near the truth. If any one, this prophet, therefore, must reflect conditions such as postulated Ezra's attempts at reformation. And, in fact, matters in Jerusalem, according to this writing, certainly looked bad enough. Let us hear what Haller says regarding it: "The functions of the priesthood have sadly been neglected (i. 7–14); the laity are dilatory in the payment of the tithes (iii. 10); the social conditions are permeated with growing faithlessness, which is evidenced by the most disgraceful disruption of family life (ii. 13–16); the few who still fear the name of Jehovah are discouraged and disappointed!" "The commands of Jehovah, which of course are known, seem to have no other purpose than to be transgressed (ii. 3 f.); in short, the moment seems to be near when Jehovah will have to interpose with his judgments to vindicate his honor and that of his true worshipers." Thus we find the conditions which, as has been shown in Nehemiah viii.–x., Ezra and Nehemiah were trying to abolish, actually reproved, and we find in the prophet who is rebuking these wrong conditions a high valuation of the very same things which we meet with in Nehemiah viii.–x., as being a cure for the degeneration:

"a high estimation of worship" (i. 6 ff.), of "the priesthood, which originally functioned as the representative of God on earth" (ii. 7), as well as "the right observance of the law (iii. 8) on which the favor of God depends" (iii. 6 f., 10 f.), "the renovation of family life" and "the revivification of the social sentiment." Most of all, we will be interested in the question as to which *written* law Malachi presupposes to have been known by the people; for that necessarily is of the greatest importance in the forming of an opinion concerning the code of Ezra. Many scholars, proceeding from the dogma that Ezra had published P, which had its origin only a short time before, seem not to be able to see clearly. Ezra does not at all question the fact that Malachi knows the statements of P as well as those of Deuteronomy! Really neck-breaking attempts to get around this fact are found in Kautzsch, who says: "After all (*sic*), there were legal statements already before the time of Ezra!"

We read with still greater amusement the following sentences of Kosters': "This prophet presupposes alone the Deuteronomic, but nowhere the priestly, law; concerning the tithe only he deviates from the former, and approaches the latter." "Malachi, then, also bears witness that, even before the introduction of P, arrangements existed with regard to the apportionment of the tithe to the personnel of the temple." And: "While the law in Deuteronomy requires that the tithe should be eaten in Jerusalem at the sacrificial meals, and the tithe of the third year alone should be distributed among the Levites in their respective homes, Malachi assumes that the whole of the tithes was to be brought into the chambers of the temple—that is to say, must meet the condition of Nehemiah xiii. 10 ff. But we may concede the fact that in this matter Malachi comes into nearer touch with P than with Dt, and still maintain (*sic!*) that he is acquainted with the second, and not with the first, law." Yea, in fact, what all may we

not be able to "maintain," if we follow the rule: *sit pro ratione voluntas?* In that case, it may be more advisable simply to admit, with Kuenen, on the ground of what Malachi says concerning tithes, that Malachi is acquainted with the requirements of P; and it is not necessary, by any means, to place Malachi in point of time after Ezra's cultural reform, in order that the pet hypothesis that "P was edited by Ezra" should not be imperiled!

We then may say that we possess in the literary works of Israel which surely, or at least most probably, originated in the time just preceding that of Ezra, no direct references to any cultural reformation being in preparation; but that at that time conditions actually prevailed in Israel which made such a reformation very *desirable*, if not urgently *necessary*. Above all, no trace anywhere can be found of the fact that the anonymous formulation of new laws had been taken in hand in Babylon or in Palestine. In the only provable case that the outline of a law was constructed at that time, the author, Ezekiel, attests his work by attaching to it his name! A written Torah is presupposed to have been known to be in existence (especially by Malachi), and to it, admittedly, belong laws out of Dt, as well as out of P. It is deplored, however, that this Torah was being so completely disregarded. If anything could make an impression upon this people, who so deliberately transgressed the law of Moses (Mal. iii. 22), it was surely *not* a newly produced law of Moses; it was, on the other hand, at most, as in 620, the investing of old laws with new authority. That Ezra succeeded in his work of cultural reform we can best see from certain psalms in the literature of Israel, which, contrary to the religious and cultic indifference which Malachi deplores, praise the beautiful services and the divine laws as the precious possessions of the Jewish people.

While an outward occasion—namely, the discovery of an old book of the law by Hilkiah—gave rise to the cultural

reform of Josiah, matters with reference to the event narrated in Nehemiah viii.–x. stand quite differently. Ezra himself relates in his memorabilia (Ezra vii. 12 ff.) that he had left Babylon with the purpose of actively engaging in reformatory work in his native land, and that he had in his hands a book of the law; he must naturally have had the intention of having this book of the law acknowledged in his country, an intention which, according to the edict cited by him, found the warmest support on the part of the Persian government. Ezra, however, does not make mention in his notes of the fact that on his arrival in Palestine he at once proceeded to introduce the law; but in our account (Neh. viii.–x.), most probably taken from his reminiscences, we learn that he succeeded at last in carrying out this design in the *presence* of Nehemiah and with his *coöperation.* These facts, then, clearly determine the *principal authors* of the Reformation: *Ezra* (and *Nehemiah*) and the *Persian government!* Now, in the first place, the questions arise: Is the book upon which Ezra relied to be considered as a work written just before with a view to reformation? and, Who, in sooth, can be considered as its author?

Since some scholars, in their studies of the Pentateuch, believe to have arrived at the conclusion that large portions of this work could have been written only during the exile, or shortly after the same, it may reasonably be supposed that we may see in the law brought by Ezra from Babylon just these sections of the Pentateuch; yea, indeed, more than this, we are in danger of *finding*, at any price, in Nehemiah viii.–x., that event upon which the "assured results of Pentateuchal criticism" rely!

While formerly the priest Ezra was regarded as only the *transmitter* of an old law, and was credited with possibly an insignificant editorial activity in the same, the supposition has been expressed repeatedly during the last few decades, and it has been attempted to prove it, that he is rather to

be considered as the *author* of the law. The question, for instance, has been asked, whether the title or designation at the beginning of the decree of Artaxerxes (Ezra vii. 12) did not point to a certain "authorship." Eduard Meyer, especially, has championed the thesis that this word did not mean the "man learned in the law of the God of heaven," but that it is simply an equivalent of author or writer. Haller, who frequently follows Meyer, says somewhat more cautiously: "Ezra is *perhaps* called the 'writer' —*i. e.*, the 'author of the law.'" As I said, Meyer is more confident; he summarizes his view in the following: "The priest Ezra, after several sketches had been made and expanded by corrections and addenda in the century after Ezekiel's time, had compiled the legal requirements in a book of the Torah of Moses, and had worked it over into a complete whole, although he had not succeeded in doing away with all the small inequalities which in a compilation of this kind are unavoidable."

Everything speaks against the possibility of translating the designation *Sopher* (Heb.), referred to above, as "he who has written the law"—*i. e.*, by "author," in a wider or narrower sense. Let us name a few things at least. It would have been, in the first place, the most foolish thing Ezra could do, had he suffered himself to be designated in the official firman, upon which he relied, as the author of a new law, even if "author" is taken to mean only "redactor," knowing as he did the traditionalism of his people. He could not more effectively have suffered his activities to be undermined! Let us, furthermore, call to mind our statement concerning the code of Hilkiah and the manner in which the success of the reformation of Josiah depended singly upon the belief that this code of Hilkiah was a very ancient work of Moses! Then, again, the edict of Artaxerxes itself certainly presumes that Ezra did not personally have anything to do with the contents of the law; for there it is assumed that the law was already

known "in far-away Syria" (that is to say, in this place: in Palestine).

Some few circumstances which do not stand closely related to the edict may be cited. First among these is Ezra's entire mental predisposition. "Painful timidity," according to Klostermann, was characteristic of him. A man who speaks with such reverence (See Nehemiah ix. 13 f.) of the commandments, statutes, and laws given by the man of God, Moses, cannot possibly have entertained the opinion that his own elaborations were of equal value with the traditional heritage, or indeed were worthy to be put in its place. Moreover, Nikel makes the following pertinent observation: "It is questionable, indeed, whether Nehemiah would lend his hand in the execution of a law which in its essentials had been the creation of Ezra. Nehemiah, it is true, knew of the powers conferred on Ezra by Artaxerxes, but Ezra, in speaking to the king, had designated his law as the law of his God. Nehemiah was sufficiently cultured and clear-sighted to recognize whether Ezra's law was really an ancient law, or whether it was the bungling work of *Sopher*." Thus all possible reasons unite in making the supposition that Ezra is designated as the *author* of the law highly improbable.

The whole manner, in which Ezra accomplishes the act of reading the law, the pulpit erected, the rising of the people to their feet when the book of the law is opened (Neh. viii. 4; ix. 3) from reverence for its contents, likewise exclude, in my judgment, the idea that the personal relation of Ezra to the code was a very close one. He feels himself to be a *scholar*, the *custodian of a precious heritage of the past*, and such a custodian he is also regarded by his compatriots. That is the impression we get as we advance, step by step, in the perusal of the section in question! If Ezra had stood in a close relation to the code as author, or even as a compiler who strongly encroached upon the con-

tents, he could not have been shielded against the reproach of being somewhat of a comedian.

Now, since our section and also the other sections of the memoirs of Ezra represent him as a personage of deep earnestness and sincerity, we cannot regard his relations to the corpus as a comparatively loose one. He might be considered as arranger and interpreter of the work; but in accordance with his whole disposition, I consider the idea that he should have *put into the code*, for which he demands such respect, *anything of his own* totally excluded. I should go only as far as Nikel—*i. e.*, simply admit that sometimes he had adapted older laws to the new conditions; that is to say, carried on an activity such as the traditions of the old laws now and then made necessary. If the relation of Ezra to the code was only that of compilator and arranger of old material, then the fact that he could wait with the official sanction of the work so long is tolerably well explained; the greater part of its contents was *known* to the people in any case; only the time had to be waited for when they were solemnly to obligate themselves with reference to its *entire* contents. This time came when, after the failure of Ezra at first, Nehemiah appeared and gave him the needed backing.

If Ezra may not be considered as the author of the work published by him, may not other writers, perhaps, be named? Proceeding upon the consideration that Ezra brought his work from Babylon, some have advanced the notion that we must seek "the circles" in which Ezra's book of the law originated in *Babylon*. That is, in a way, the view of Berthelot, when he says that Ezra appears as "writer of the law"; but that did not mean that Ezra had freely compiled it, but that he had gathered into a whole the output of a *school* which had been at work for decades, and had brought it to a conclusion. What is to be thought of such "circles" or "schools," I have shown in my writing on Josiah: they are mostly *invented* when the case arises of

having to evade the obvious embarrassment to have to name an author of a writing. These "circles" or "schools" generally dissolve into nothing when placed under the microscope. And thus it is here!

To this thesis—namely, that Ezra's book of the law had been created in Babylon and had been forced upon the Jews in Palestine—we answer: Is it not perfectly absurd that the Jews in exile should have thought of formulating a cultural law for Jerusalem? How, upon the whole, could they entertain the thought in exile of being able to lead the people to a conduct more pleasing to God by the setting up of a new law? And where, indeed, are "the circles" of those Babylonian Jews who were engaged in fabricating laws to be *looked for in the historic traditions?* Answers to these questions have not been wanting, but none of them has any *force of conviction.* We have shown before that Ezekiel cannot be adduced as witness of the fact that whole circles in Babylon were engaged in the formulation of laws. Concerning the "law of holiness" all has been said that is necessary. Then, again, we ask: Where are to be found these nebulous "circles" of fabricators of laws in Babylon?

Bruno Bauer, writing in a similar case in contradiction of Strauss, says: "Circles have no hands and write no books. Definite personalities are here required!" In the absence of the production of such, one must exclaim, "Ignoramus!" After 538 there could not have existed in Babylon any considerable circles of priests; and neither in Babylon nor in Palestine, according to the testimony of both Malachi and Ezekiel, did the majority of priests evince any particular interest in matters of religion.

Since "circles of priests" are probably not to be thought of in connection with the authorship of the code of Ezra, it was believed possible to begin further back with the prophets, who so frequently and so vigorously took part in the religious development of Israel. These, in the century preceding Ezra's time, exhibit *really stronger* cultic ten-

dencies as compared with former prophets of Israel, as we have previously shown. Think of Ezekiel (especially chapters xl.–xlviii.), of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi! But not even the shadow of evidence that prophets had engaged in the construction of laws, and that, too, as it were, "under the mantle of secrecy," can be adduced from the history of Israel.

But if neither Ezra nor "priestly nor prophetic circles" are to be considered as probable authors of the law, then it is to no purpose to seek further for authors among the Babylonian or Palestinian Jews of those days. What do expressions like the following profit us: "The tendency in the direction of Leviticism was then in the air;" the law was written down as "an expression of the belief of the congregation," etc.? These are phrases which are not even measurably true. For the historical writers in exile, of whom we know at *least something* from the books of the Kings, evidently did *not* entertain these "Levitical tendencies," and in the memoirs of Ezra also it is the sacrificial cult which plays a most inconsiderable part!

Then let us ask: What do we imagine to have been the manner of procedure of those fabricators of the code of Ezra? In case the P is supposed to have been their creation, in favor of which, as will have to be shown, nothing in the account practically speaks, they went to work half in a *stupid*, and half in an *artful* manner! They would have committed the great folly of having attributed to Moses (Neh. viii. 1), whose testament they had before them in D (cf. xii. 10, where the passage over Jordan, soon to take place, is mentioned), utterances which would in part strongly contradict this testament, and which would really have made this testament of none effect, as a matter of course, before it could be made effective.

"For the sake of consistency," as Kautzsch says, "the authors constructed theories which were practically impossible to carry out; think, for instance, of the year of

jubilee. They imposed requirements (for instance, the ark of the covenant, the Urim and Thummim) the fashioning of which by human hands at the time of the introduction of the law could not be thought of; [because, forsooth] these holy objects could not be made by human hands."[1] The "thora-forming imagination" misled them, in short, to such incredible things that one must admire their *folly*, if, fortunately, nothing more were in question than the mere vagaries of modern scholars.

The authors of the fabricated law of Ezra are said by the critics to have "evinced great skill." Haller especially charges them with being capable of the most astonishing intellectual performances. They deck their whole work in a comparatively harmless historic garb and transfer their aims for the future to remote prehistoric times. With diligence, they sought to hold fast "the costume of Mosaic times and to veil, as much as could be done, the present time." "Their new inventions they skillfully mingled with the ancient traditional heritage," and thereby created for many scholars of the present day the grateful task of discovering, "by means of the greatest sagacity," the primary and secondary constituent parts of their work, and making it possible for them to pronounce the code of Ezra, as to its contents, now as old, and then again as a recent production, as the exigencies of the moment demand. They also were guilty of considerable negligence in the matter of form. But fortunately—or perhaps through cunning—although in their circle "the system" seems to have been the main thing, later generations could still recognize their activities as authors. Sometimes, indeed, those authors

---

[1]The attention of the readers of this series has already been called to the contents of the tomb of Pharaoh Tut-ankh-amen, recently discovered at Luxor, which show a workmanship in wood, gold, and precious stones, which goes back to an age before Moses, and which surpasses the delicate and expensive workmanship of the ark and the Urim and Thummim.—*The Editor.*

went very far in their artfulness; for instance, from "archaistic considerations," they did not even name Jerusalem, the historic metropolis of the priests; in the place of the temple, toward which their endeavors were directed, they put a movable tabernacle; the arrangement of the forty-eight cities for the clergy was "very strange." Besides this, they forgot, alas! to add a commentary as to what was "really meant in earnest," and what was merely "archaistic garnishment." Might not the most painful mistakes arise from this!

But we will leave the domain of fruitless hypotheses, and try to formulate our *own results*. These can only be as follows: The section Nehemiah viii.–x. furnishes us with no kind of support for the claim that the book of the law which Ezra caused to be read had been written by Ezra himself, or any one else, a short time previous to its publication.

Let us now turn ourselves to the question, How is the success of the reformation of Ezra to be accounted for? As seen from Nehemiah viii. 1, the people themselves desired the law to be read; had immediately and willingly complied with its declarations, and had finally obligated themselves, by the signatures of their appointed representatives, to conscientiously abide by its requirements. It was the law then which, *in the first place, had had the greatest success*. This would not be at all surprising if the matter in question had been an assembling, or perhaps a new arrangement, of ancient laws which had been previously acknowledged. The entire act of the reading and the signing of the law might then be compared to the act of a Lutheran congregation in assuming the obligations of the *Confessio Augustana*. But if, on the contrary, the matter in question in regard to the code of Ezra was that of a book of the law only recently written, as many Old Testament investigators assume, then even the first *success* remains a complete *riddle*.

Now, if we suppose that the code of Ezra did not have one author, but that circles or "schools" had been at work upon it—in short, that an intensive redactional activity had taken place with it previous to the publication of the law—then the passivity of the people becomes *incomprehensible.* The people who, according to Eduard Meyer, were thoroughly acquainted with the old traditions, would certainly have been very wroth if, suddenly, modern substitutes had been placed before them. One need only imagine a change in the hymn book or in the liturgy, or think of a revised "Luther-Bible"; and in the case of Ezra —laws were in question! According to Wellhausen and his followers, it would not have been at all difficult to prove the Mosaic garb of P as a forgery: "Only the faintest traces yet show, as it were in a telltale manner, the starting point of the development." But, fortunately, just at that time no one was as sagacious as the critics of to-day: the "telltale traces" were discerned by nobody! Yea, even more than this: the duped people evinced even a wondrously exact comprehension of the real purposes of the new lawgivers. Moeller, with delightful irony, says: "The bungling work of the authors is again squared up by the congenial intelligence of the people." "For," he adds, "we should in truth expect that the building of a tabernacle would have been proceeded with immediately. But nothing of the kind is done; it was simply identified with the temple."

The critics like to intrench themselves behind the assertion that the Persian authorities had compelled the introduction of the new law. Thus Haller, for instance, writes: "The smooth carrying out of the cultic reform can be accounted for only on the supposition that the law of the priests had been buttressed by royal sanction, which also afforded outward protection." Can we think hardly of Moeller when he sarcastically remarks: "If criticism is in the right, then would the Israelites have permitted a

totally different image of their history to be forced upon them three times? Three times they have the goodness to suffer this to be done, the three assemblages of laws, each (as the critics say) contradicting the others; but, all the same, introduced as Mosaic!"

In reviewing once more, and finally, the whole question as to the originators of the code of Ezra and as to its astonishing success, we can only say, with Klostermann: "The conclusion lies near at hand that the book could not acquire the importance which it had gained so long as even the shadow of a possibility remained that it owed the appearance of its antiquity to an illusion of human weakness, or to the deception of premeditated artfulness."

Our narrative begins by relating that on the first day of the seventh month—the old festival month, "which also in the time after the exile remained the beginning of the ecclesiastical year—all the people, as one man, gathered themselves into the street that was before the water gate, and requested Ezra to bring the book of the law of Moses which the Lord had commanded to Israel." The consequence of the instruction of the people which followed was that, when they heard the words of the law, they began to weep. Their tears were not to be thought of as tears of *surprise!* The people wept because they remembered the better days of the past, "and had to confess to themselves how little they had conformed to the requirements of the law." "The happy New Year's day" comes to a conclusion, which is evidently not such as the leaders of the people desired. For this reason, the governor, Nehemiah, and Ezra, the priest, and the Levites exhort the people: "This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep" (verse 9). *Who* may be considered to have been the speaker of verse 10, is not said; it was probably Nehemiah, who advises that the day should be observed as a *joyous holiday*, on which also the poor should be remembered with charitable gifts. How the celebration ended,

and whether, upon the whole, the act of assuming the obligation to the law followed immediately upon the prayer of Ezra, we do not know. It is most probable that the contract was ratified and signed that day (24, 7). The order in which we find the signers named is remarkable: The rulers, the Levites, then the priests. As may be readily supposed, the first who signs is Nehemiah; then follows Zidkijah, according to Eduard Meyer, "perhaps the representative of the congregation of the people," "the president of the council of elders." Hereupon follow the names of twenty-one priests, seventeen Levites, and forty-four chiefs of the people. This closes the list of those who signed by name.

Just as in the before-mentioned "cultic reformation of Josiah," in 620, a book of the law in 445 formed the background of all the measures which were taken by Ezra and Nehemiah. The reading out of the book of the law is central in the national assembly which takes place on the first day of the seventh month. In order to give attention to the words of the *law*, the chiefs of the tribes of the whole people meet with Ezra. In accordance with the *law*, the feast of tabernacles is kept, and during the feast itself the daily reading of *portions of the law* plays an important part. Also, on the great day of fasting on the twenty-fourth day of the same month, the *law* was read for three hours, and, in the great prayer which Ezra offers before the people, particular emphasis is laid upon the *law* (ix. 13 f.). The tenth chapter, finally, relates that the signers of the contract under oath and imprecations asseverate that they will "walk in God's law which was given by Moses, the servant of God, and observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our God and his judgments and his statutes."

If we desire to obtain clearness with regard to the nature of the law book of Ezra, not a little depends upon the manner of its introduction and designation. The very first verse of Nehemiah viii. brings an important notice.

Here we hear in an unobjectionable account, probably emanating from Ezra himself, that Moses is brought into the very closest relation to the work by the people from the very first. In the opinion of most of the modern scholars, this, forsooth, is not to be considered as at all essential. Haller, for instance, states with epic prolixity that, in Israel, *all* books of the law had to be referred back to Moses, if they were to obtain recognition; it was commonly said in such a case: Moses had been, once for all, the "oracle par excellence"; but neither Haller, nor any of his friends, disclose to us how this strange conceit can have *arisen* in Israel, since, indeed, Moses did not "really" give any laws at all.

It is to-day widely considered as self-evident that on the occasion of the national assembly, about which Ezra speaks (Neh. viii.), only those portions of our Pentateuch were brought to the knowledge of the people which we term the code of priests (P). As is well known, it is understood to be "a product of the exilic and post-exilic authorship of the law, in which the detailed representation of the *legal* institutions was connected with a reflective representation of the history of the children of Israel."

It has been asserted that Ezra's law had mediated to the people something entirely new, and nothing cheering; yea, more. that the reading of the code must have *immediately begun* with *legal* sections. Thus, for instance, argues Nikel, when he says: "We must carefully discriminate between 'the reading of the law' (Neh. viii. 3, 13, 14; ix. 3) and the 'assuming the *obligation* to the same' (Neh. x. 30). Only a *legal* code was *read.* This, among other things, is shown by the fact that the congregation was moved to such an extent by hearing the words 'of the law' read that they wept (Neh. viii. 9). Their tears were tears of grief, for Ezra spoke to the people: 'Mourn not, nor weep!' The cause of the grief, as we see from the context, was the consciousness of the people that the laws which

had been read had been neglected so long. *From this it follows, that Ezra had at the very beginning read statutes of the law; consequently, he could not have begun with Genesis i.*" There is much truth in these sentences, but just that with which in this connection we are alone concerned we can *not* admit!

With what Ezra *began* his reading, whether the code from which laws were read really contained only laws, etc., we are not at all able to determine with certainty from the very summary notices of Nehemiah viii. 9 ff. Ezra read *from* the book, but did not bring the book itself to a complete reading; that the people were made to grieve, we do indeed learn; but we are not informed in detail as to what was the cause of this grief. As to the contents of the code of Ezra, we can only infer from Nehemiah viii. 9 ff. in detail that it contained laws.

With regard to the second half of the eighth chapter, matters stand quite different. For in verses 14–17 it is undoubtedly presumed that the code of Ezra must have contained specific directions regarding the celebration of the feast of tabernacles. Conclusions have been drawn from Nehemiah viii. 13 ff. in regard to what the code of Ezra must have *contained;* it has been deemed possible to argue from these verses that some things we read in our Pentateuch of to-day *cannot possibly* have been a constituent part of the writing of Ezra.

But we are by no means confined to Nehemiah viii. 13–18 for the proof of what was contained in the code of Ezra. We have already shown, when we spoke of this work, that it is introduced with terms which very closely resemble the formulæ that were customary in the code of Josiah, so much so that we are driven to the conclusion that the code of Ezra must be intimately connected with the code of Josiah, either in such way that it was identical with or inclusive of it. But the code of Josiah, as is generally known, contained, in the first place, constituent parts

which we read to-day in the fifth book of Moses! Now, many more traces in our account (Neh. viii.–x.) actually point to this fifth book of Moses than to such legal portions as, in a narrower or broader sense, are generally reckoned to be parts of P. Nor should we overlook the fact that the reading of the law, as reported in Nehemiah viii. 1 ff., 18, ix. 3, is most emphatically called for in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut. xxxi. 9 ff.). Then, again, consider the note in Nehemiah viii. 10. There the people, who were very much dejected at the reading of the law, are called upon by the leaders of the congregation to be joyous and charitable, obviously in express conformity with Deuteronomy xvi. 14.

In summarizing our observations on Nehemiah ix., we should say that the prayer (ix. 6 ff.), whether really uttered in nearly the same words, or later given a literary form by Ezra, take it all in all, breathes the spirit of Deuteronomy and of those portions of the Pentateuch which we generally designate by JE. There may be found in the prayer, it is true, some few passages, which make an acquaintance with the so-called P-sections of the Pentateuch very probable; but they have scarcely any weight, when we consider the tone of the chapter and its contents as a whole. If a code Pg+Ph, hitherto entirely unknown, had shortly before been published by Ezra, we should have before us an inexplicable enigma!

Now, if we find from chapter viii. that the directions in Leviticus xxiii. (whether beginning with verse 33 or with verse 39 cannot be said with certainty) must have been contained in the code of Ezra, we are forced by the whole spirit of the prayer (Neh. ix. 6 ff.) and the great number of approaches in this prayer to portions of the Pentateuch, usually designated as D and JE, to the conclusion that also D- and JE-sections of our Pentateuch were parts of the code of Ezra. Which sections in particular these may have been may be learned by consulting the commentaries.

It is impossible to determine from Nehemiah viii.–x. the contents of the code of Ezra in detail. Certain, however, it is that *those* parts of the Pentateuch which, as was believed, could be segregated as Pg+Ph are not sufficient to be considered as the contents of the code of Ezra; furthermore that, doubtless, parts of D, and presumably parts of JE, belonged to this work. The older hypothesis, according to which our Pentateuch of to-day had been carried from Babylon and published in 445, cannot be *substantiated* from Nehemiah viii.–x. alone; but, after what we are able to infer from Nehemiah viii.–x., it comes infinitely nearer to the truth than the poorly substantiated Pg+Ph hypothesis. If as Bertheau-Ryssell concludes from Nehemiah x. 31–49 that P+Dt+Ex. xx.–xxiii., xxxiv. was in question in Ezra's work, and hence, probably, the whole Pentateuch should be considered as the law book of Ezra, then it is not to be denied that there is much to be said in favor of this assertion, but that it cannot be strictly proven from Nehemiah viii.–x. *alone.*

Both our discussion concerning the "name of the book of the law," and also the attempt to determine its "contents," led us to the assumption that Ezra must have published a voluminous work. Are there—so we must now ask—any distinct indications to be found in the section Nehemiah viii.–x. pointing to the size of the volume?

While formerly the opinion generally prevailed that quite a portly work (that is to say, our Pentateuch of to-day) had been published by Ezra, at this time, as we have seen, the majority of investigators of the Old Testament are of the opinion that Ezra had brought to acceptance a rather small volume (Pg+Ph). Although critics, on other occasions, never tire of emphasizing the frightful adherence to a scheme, the want of conformity to the national character, the impracticability of many requirements of the P, they demand of us that we are to imagine that the people had suffered these "monotonous," "weari-

some" statements in a reading lasting many hours to be imposed upon them.[1]

The main argument for the thesis that a comparatively brief book had been read by Ezra is found for many, not in Nehemiah viii. 3, but in Nehemiah viii. 13. There we read: "And on the second day were gathered together the chief of the fathers of all the people, the priests and the Levites, unto Ezra, the scribe, even to understand the words of the law." Then follows the communication that there had been discovered in the reading commandments such as we find in Leviticus xxiii. 39–43. Now it is argued: If in regard to the code of Ezra a large work, say one of the size of the Pentateuch, had been in question it would have been impossible to advance with the reading of it up to the middle of the entire volume as early as the second day. This seems to be plausible, but this conclusion does not rest upon a very firm basis. In the first place, we have already stated that, in the reading of the first day, the question was not at all concerning the *reading of the book*, but rather concerning *a reading from the book*.

Is it not almost generally supposed by the Old Testament science of to-day that a work, up to that time utterly unknown to the Jewish people, had been published by Ezra; and is it not deemed possible to adduce proofs of this fact from the account before us that are irrefragable? In the first place, it is said, it follows from the weeping of the people that they must have heard something that was utterly novel to them. Secondly, the action of the Levites, who have to make the people thoroughly acquainted with the contents of what had been read, proves conclusively that the people previous to that time had had no exact

[1]This refers to the higher critical claim that only a fabricated naked code of "monotonous," "wearisome" Levitical laws had been read by Ezra to the people. It is critically denied that the historical parts of the Pentateuch, as such, were then in existence.—*The Editor.*

knowledge of the contents of the code of Ezra; for, is it not expressly said (viii. 12), "They had understood the words that were read to them"? Thirdly, it is mentioned in regard to a particular case, that is to say, the observance of the feast of the tabernacles (Neh. viii. 14), that the requirements of the law were not familiar to those who heard. And, in the fourth place, it is distinctly asseverated (Neh. viii. 17) that, since time immemorial, the Feast of Tabernacles had not been observed in the manner prescribed by the law.

Let us now trace these four arguments somewhat more closely. Does it really and necessarily follow from the fact that the people wept that they had heard something hitherto entirely new to them? And must we then believe those tears to have been tears of painful surprise and of conscious guilt? Quite aside from the fact that Ezekiel had preached the doctrine of individual rewards or punishments, and that, therefore, many among the people could not feel guilty of transgressing a law of which they could know nothing, their tears are to be understood to have a different cause and meaning. On November 6, 1919, I read the eighth chapter of Nehemiah in Hebrew together with ten higher class boys, and I propounded to them this question: "Why do the people weep?" The answer was: "From sadness." When I called attention to the fact that to-day it is almost universally believed that on this occasion an entirely new law had been read to the people for the first time, this assumption was met with almost unanimous dissent. When on September 2, 1920, I was discussing with the second highest class the chapters, Nehemiah viii.–x., in the religious instruction, I had exactly the same experience, with this only difference, that the answer given was: "From emotion." I believe we have before us here an unprejudiced objective judgment. Not the feeling of personal guilt, nor surprise at the novelty of what they had heard, but sadness caused by hearing again

the reading of half-forgotten laws out of the days of the past calls forth from the people this outburst of painful feeling.

The matter then stands thus: The law had, indeed, *become* unknown to the people, but had *formerly*, at least in its main features, *been known* to them. From the weeping of the people it does not by any means follow that they had experienced something hitherto unheard of. On the contrary, the tears are nothing else than "tears of profound emotion" at the thought of the graciousness of God, who had, it would seem, finally taken away entirely the reproach of his people. Then, again, the fact that the Levites take active part in commenting upon the law is adduced as an argument that the code of Ezra must have contained something entirely new. As a rule, the Levites, it is true, are placed to the credit of the chronicler, but in this case they are not unwelcome to some of the critics in their defense of the P-hypothesis!

The interpretation of the law on the part of the Levites does not by any means prove that a new law was in question. What deplorable experiences of ignorance among the rural population did not Luther's journey of visitation in Saxony bring to light; and how about the knowledge of the Bible among our, upon the whole, "Christian" people? Who would dare to assert that numberless sections of the Bible do not have to be made "intelligible anew" to many Christians? That the interpretation of the law by the Levites does not prove anything as to the novelty of the law is shown, moreover, by the fact that also in later times, when the Pentateuch was indisputably recognized and accepted, such exposition in detail was considered necessary. I must here also lay stress upon the fact that those same scholars who speak of an entirely new book of the law, in other places allow this "newness" to recede far into the background.

But does not the individual case of the Feast of Taber-

nacles prove that what was read to the people had been entirely new? This, too, I emphatically deny! In the first place, as regards the turn, "And they found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses" (Neh. viii. 14), we meet with this form also elsewhere, for instance, in a place where it cannot possibly mean "to read something new for the first time." I am thinking of Nehemiah xiii. 1, where the wording is almost identically the same: "On that day they read in the book of Moses in the audience of the people; and therein was found written," etc.

That the people had been utterly surprised at what the law required, and had felt it to be something altogether new, is *not* found in the text; in it we only find it indicated that those who read were not acquainted with the details of the requirements. Then the communication is made. Now the requirements, as a matter of course, were at once carried out. In short, we gain the impression, exactly as in Nehemiah xiii. 1 ff., that the law itself is not felt to be a novelty, but that the people are no longer quite familiar with the *details* of the matter.

Then there remains only the fourth argument, that is to say, that in Nehemiah viii. 17 the fact is definitely substantiated that, from time immemorial, the Feast of Tabernacles had not been observed in the manner prescribed by the law. Bertheau-Ryssell correctly says: "Herewith we do not say that the great autumnal festival had not been observed from the days of Joshua—that is, from the conquest of the land of Palestine by the Israelites, up to the time of Ezra, . . . but only that it had not been observed by the congregation of Israel in such a manner during the whole time from the conquest of the land by Joshua." The principal difference between the festival at this time and that of former days consisted, no doubt, in the fact that the congregation again, as at the time of their wanderings through the wilderness, *lived* in booths; for in the verse in question the fact is emphasized that the chiefs of the people, after

having insight of the law, took measures for the procuring of branches for the booths at the proper time, and that the people really lived in booths.

But it is not necessary to remain on the defensive in regard to the question concerning "a law which had been formerly known, or was entirely unknown." An abundance of arguments prove with certainty that no entirely new law, unknown to the people before that time, was promulgated by Ezra. But it will not do to assert, as does Wellhausen, that certain portions of the code of Ezra—and such portions as it is thought can be proved from the Pentateuch to be old—were fully known by the people, and that others, again, had been entirely unknown to them: for this assumption, the account in Nehemiah viii.–x., at least, furnishes no support. What Moeller says against Wellhausen's methodic blunders is here well founded. So then we gain the following results from chapter viii.: "The people were cognizant of the book of the law, but were, even in their leading circles, no longer very familiar with its contents."

In the firman (Ezra vii. 22 ff.) we find the words: "And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of God that is in thy hand, set magistrates and judges which may judge all the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God; and teach thou them that know them not." Here it is most plainly taken for granted that Ezra's law was one not unknown, but one widely known already. All the arguments advanced by the opponents of the genuineness of the firman have been thoroughly refuted. Indeed, Stade has expressed his belief in the authenticity of the contents of the edict, and asserts that the content of the royal decree bears the stamp of truth in itself, in such manner as could not have been impressed upon it by any outward attestation. Eduard Meyer has gone still further, for he utters this sentence: "I assert that the document is authentic from A to Z, as regards both form and contents." The

Jewish coloring of the decree may easily be explained by supposing that Ezra himself had submitted it to the king in outline, for the purpose of ratification, and that as to its essentials it had been sanctioned according to the manuscript.

Ezra—so far as we know—did not at first make use of the firman. But to our regret we know very little, upon the whole, of the earlier years of his stay in Palestine; then, again, as we have stated before, that which we know concerning this period of time sufficiently explains his non-use of the firman: in the first place, Ezra did not find it at all necessary, when an old law of Israel was in question, to appeal continuously to the Persian edict. Those who "understood the law" (vii. 25) will in many instances have complied with its requirements, even without a firman; those "who did not know the law" he could not force to the acknowledgment of it, because he did not have the power to do so. Besides this, it would have been very unwise in Ezra if he had appealed to the Persian edict without imperative necessity; of course, it was best for the people if they voluntarily, and without pressure on the part of Persia, accepted the law.

And now let us for further enlightenment turn to Ezra's fight against mixed marriages (Ezra ix. 1–x. 44). We must assume that this took place immediately after Ezra's arrival in Palestine, that is to say, thirteen years before the events narrated in Nehemiah viii.-x. There Ezra in his lengthy prayer, which we must conceive to have been spoken in presence of witnesses (Ezra x. 1 ff), quoted an utterance of a prophet (Ezra ix. 11, 12), which is not found in any of the prophecies, but has its foundation in the literature of Jewish legislation; and this utterance, indeed, is a mixture of Deuteronomic turns and of such as are found in the code of the priests. In regard to this passage, Bertholet writes: "Ezra does not quote the

law verbatim, but in a quite free and arbitrary combination."

Ezra, even *before* the promulgation of the law, Nehemiah viii.–x., quotes legal directions that are taken from P by the side of the D, which surely belonged to the code of Josiah, and which (according to the opinion of the critics) could not have been known to the people at all; furthermore, that he considered these directions as old and venerable is certainly proved by their having been derived from the prophets! And that he treated both collections of laws as altogether of equal value, when he combined utterances taken from them, is equally certain. And how, indeed, could he have dared to hold the people responsible for the non-observance of laws of which they could have had no knowledge whatever?

Finally, some brief remarks may follow on the passage Nehemiah vi. 10 ff. Judging from that, Nehemiah scrupulously avoids, as a layman, to enter the interior of the temple. This strict observance of cultic requirements, which are the fruit of the spirit of P, confirms likewise the fact that even before the events narrated in Nehemiah viii.–x. pious Jews *observed* the laws which Ezra is said to have introduced as new.

The separation of the Samaritan congregation from the Jewish congregation must have taken place not long after Ezra's time. In Nehemiah xiii. 28 it is related that Nehemiah drove from him a grandson of the high priest Eliashib, because he had become a son-in-law of the Horonite Sanballat. "He became, as is known, the organizer of the Samaritan congregation," says Eduard Meyer. Latterly, it is true, the attempt has been made to move down as far as possible, in point of time, the formation of the cultic society of Samaritans, and to separate it more decidedly from the events related in Nehemiah viii.–x., in order not to endanger the dogma of a law (P) introduced by Ezra, which hitherto had been unknown. The effort is vain, for

the only crown witness for this assertion, Josephus, who has often been proved to have been wrongly informed, and who has been convicted of manufacturing fables, cannot, of course, be placed over against the note in Nehemiah xiii. 28.

But why has this matter concerning the Samaritans, the details of which we cannot now enter upon, such great importance for the question involved in this section? The answer is simple enough. The Samaritans, who dissolved their connection with the Jewish congregation soon after the reformation of the cult by Ezra, under circumstances exceedingly bitter for them, adopted the Pentateuch as their law book. Is it probable that the Samaritans would have made this choice had a new law, whose adoption had been secured by their deadliest enemy, been contained in the Pentateuch, which, as we have seen, must have been so nearly the same as the code of Ezra? We can only answer: "Impossible!" Only if an old and venerable book of the law, over against which doubts concerning genuineness were entirely out of the question, had been newly enforced by Ezra can their adhesion to the Pentateuch be explained, seeing they must have known it to contain Ezra's code, or else to be identical with it. Especially Wellhausen, who, as we know, seeks to make it appear that the P was published by Ezra "in the envelope of the Pentateuch," has here argued not unwisely. He says: "Since, no doubt, the Samaritans received from the Jews, not the P, but the entire Pentateuch, the most plausible assumption, and one we cannot abandon without imperative necessity, is that Ezra did not raise the P, as such, but the Pentateuch, to the importance of a law book." We should go further still, and conclude Wellhausen's sentence thus: "So then the most tenable assumption is that, upon the whole, Ezra did not publish jointly an entirely new unknown law." If Ezra had brought with him from Babylon and introduced a new law (let us say P), we might have expected that the

Samaritans, who were deeply offended at Ezra because of the dissolution of the mixed marriages, would claim to be the guardians of the genuine ancient traditions and flatly refuse to accept the new laws or dogmas. At least, in this way, at other times, such schisms are wont to be consummated. I am particularly reminded of the Old Lutherans and the Old Catholics. Why, for a variety, should it have been different in this case?

Have we in our possession to-day the code of Ezra? As to this question, the account in Nehemiah viii.–x. can scarcely furnish us any material; it could only show us which passages out of our Pentateuch were, perhaps, under discussion. That our Pentateuch of to-day is exactly identical with the code of Ezra can in no wise be deduced from Nehemiah viii.–x. with certainty. The fact that the Samaritans borrowed our Pentateuch not long after 445 from the Jews, which therefore had been considered by the Jews at that time as sacred scripture, and the further fact that, after 445, no official act can be shown by which the Pentateuch, accepted by the Samaritans, had been declared by the Jews to be *scriptura sacra*, cause it to be a probability bordering on certainty that our Pentateuch stands in very close relation to the code of Ezra.

Gunkel once made the assertion: "It is Wellhausen's undying merit to have recognized the real character of this source (by which P is meant), which up to that time had been regarded as the oldest, and thereby has shown the fallacy of the former view of the Old Testament as a whole, and has thus prepared the way for a vivid, truly historic understanding of the religious history of the Jews." Who has not possibly read during the last decades similar sentences of victorious assurance in works of Old Testament science? And how strongly do they contrast with the reality!

Let us once more summarize what, as a rule, is to-day being deduced from Nehemiah viii.–x.: It is asserted that

a work of small compass was written and published by Ezra not long before, unknown to the hearers as to its essentials, purporting to be of Mosaic origin, a work which can almost literally be picked out of our Pentateuch. This work is said to have consisted of two parts, Pg+Ph, which just previous to that time had been welded together by Ezra into a unity. According to Wellhausen's opinion, Ezra at once submitted this new work for adoption by the congregation in the "envelope of the Pentateuch." Eduard Meyer and the most of the modern investigators say that he had procured the adoption of that work by itself alone, and that the union with the remaining portions of the Pentateuch had taken place at a later time. In opposition to this, *we* had to establish the fact—while avoiding any squinting at the sources of the Pentateuch—that Ezra had procured the complete adoption by his fellow countrymen of a voluminous work, which had long been known by his hearers, but had come into desuetude as to its details. This work, in some of its details, is in close touch with the most various parts of our Pentateuch of to-day. We may therefore readily assume that it was not far removed from our Pentateuch of to-day, an assumption which is rendered exceedingly probable by the taking over of the Pentateuch by the Samaritans not long after 445, and by the absence of a renewed act of obligation to the Pentateuch, which we should infallibly have to expect, if Nehemiah viii.–x. did *not* itself treat of the Pentateuch. There is not the least reason for believing that laws of quite recent construction were found in the code of Ezra.

The fact that at the introduction of the code of Ezra evidently no protests whatever ensued, but that the people rather generally accommodated themselves to the law, and, at the most, offered only a passive resistance (only think of the absence of the signature of the high priest!); and, furthermore, that no *originators whatever* of the construction of a new law in Babylon can be named goes very

far to prove that, on the contrary, *only ancient laws* can have been in question in the code of Ezra. How else, forsooth, could we explain the separate paragraphs in Nehemiah x. 31 ff., which can be satisfactorily explained only upon the hypothesis that ancient laws had been codified in accordance with the conditions of present time? If we place opposite to each other our well-established statements and the current views of the criticism of to-day, we are forced to say this: We can conceive of no stronger contrast! If our view should prove the correct one, this could not possibly be without influence upon the criticism of the Pentateuch. The nail to which it was hoped to be able to fasten the hypothesis of the origin of the priestly document in Babylon proved to be too loose: the section Nehemiah viii.–x. does not contain a single syllable about the introduction of a new (supposedly ancient) law!

The whole section, Nehemiah viii.–x., with its strong emphasis upon ancient laws, dating their origin back to the time of Moses, is, upon the whole, as unfavorable to the assumption of a fabrication and sanctioning of new laws as can be conceived. The accord between the legislative sections and the course of the history of Israel, such as especially Wellhausen has constructed, does not in reality exist. The reality shows us (2 Kings xxii., etc., and Neh. viii.–x.) that only ancient laws, concerning the Mosaic origin of which there could be no doubt, could expect adoption at the hands of Israel. Consequently, the "vivid, truly historic understanding of the religious history of Israel," of which Gunkel speaks in the place before mentioned, does not in the remotest sense exist in our day.

Thus it is that a vast wall of prejudice and unfounded hypothesis has hitherto shut out—especially in the domain of Pentateuchal criticism—"a truly *historic* understanding" of the religious life of the people of Israel. It is necessary, first of all, as our investigation has shown, to open the pathway again in matters of detail. Then only can the

Pentateuch, abused during the last few decades by being childishly divided into fragments, again become historically intelligible. How this is to be accomplished in detail is not in the province of our present essay to determine. Klostermann once said: "It is necessary to create sure foundations for the criticism of the Pentateuch in the future, and to impart new impulses to its exegesis, which has become barren through the breeding in by the schools of a purpose to work over the canonical Pentateuch from a purely philological standpoint." And this is of the first necessity.

Indeed, as Klostermann further observes, there exists the necessity to re-commence the literary-historical investigation concerning the origin of the Pentateuch from absolutely safe points and after a generally valid method. Such "absolutely safe points" can be found, I think, outside of the Pentateuch, but still in the canonical record. In 2 Kings xxii., etc., and in Nehemiah viii.–x. such "points" are, I believe, to be found. For that reason, I have repeatedly tried in my writing, "The Religious Reformation of Josiah," as in this writing, concerning "The Reformation of Ezra," to call attention to these passages. I trust that some of my statements may find the approval of genuinely scientific criticism—if not just now, then in some later and happier day.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 4

Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?

By
ROBERT DICK WILSON, Ph.D., D.D.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1925

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 4.—"Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" Clearly Attested Facts Showing That the Destructive "Assured Results of Modern Scholarship" Are Indefensible. By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Semitic Philology in Princeton Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 5.—"The Integrity of the Old Testament," by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law (London); Author of "The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism," "The Origin of the Pentateuch," "Pentateuchal Studies," "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," "Studies in Biblical Law," etc. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 6.—"Archæology Vs. Wellhausenism; or, In What Respect Have the Foundations of the Religio-Historical System of Wellhausen Been Proven Unstable by Modern Researches in the Ancient Orient?" By Professor Ernest Sellin (Berlin). With an Introduction by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	$0.25
Per dozen copies, postpaid	2.50

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER FOUR.

Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?

Clearly Attested Facts Showing That the Destructive "Assured Results of Modern Scholarship" Are Indefensible.

BY ROBERT DICK WILSON, PH.D., D.D., PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC PHILOLOGY IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

With Introduction by the Editor.

IV

INTRODUCTION.

In the introductory number of this series, "The Crisis of Criticism," repeated reference is made to the essay of Dr,. Wilson's which follows. We have freely and confidently counted this booklet the most complete and convincing argument which has yet been contributed to the literature of Bible criticism. Three considerations have led us to this conclusion: First, the argument comes from a man who has prepared himself in the most extraordinary fashion in Semitic scholarship; second, the argument deals directly and radically with the point most fundamental in the problem of Bible science, and is carried to a completion not hitherto compassed—namely, as to the words and categories, or groups of words, in the Scriptures, as they were originally impressed with the facts of time, place, history, and direct environment; third, in his argument the author has exhibited for the first time in the history of Bible science direct and attested proof from the linguistic differentia of the Scriptures that they can be explained upon no other basis than the claim made for them by tradition. All this will come clearly to the mind of the reader as he pursues the arguments of Dr. Wilson.

It is a rule of the utmost value to the student of Bible science that the objective proofs of Scripture are those which are at last conclusive in criticism. Subjectivism has been the bane of Bible science during the past hundred years. From Hegel and Vatke to Wellhausen and Delitzsch the evil has worked. These with their followers have come to the judgment of the Scriptures with preconceived theories and hypotheses. Philosophical obsession and scholastic notions have created a state of mind, a subjective predilection, wholly impossible to a right con-

struction and interpretation of Bible history and fact. Dr. Wilson's work is epoch-making in that it discovers the true objective, the perpetually safe point of beginning, in Bible history construction.

A saying of Dr. Wilson's in this connection is suggestive of the illumination which is to guide in the future of Bible criticism: "No man knows enough to assail the truthfulness of the Old Testament." Once that utterance might have passed as the shibboleth of the orthodox pulpit; but now it is to stand as the highest dictum of scholarship. Pragmatism has too often been convicted of rashness and false conclusion to leave it any claim to respect aside from naked proof. The answer to all destructivism is in the Word itself, in a faithful and capable interpretation of its contents and their relation to the facts of life and history and "the contemporaneous documents of other nations."

From Dr. Philip E. Howard, publisher of the *Sunday School Times*, we have secured the esteemed privilege of using Dr. Wilson's booklet in the "Aftermath Series." Our readers will thank us for the following paragraphs from the pen of Dr. Howard relative to Dr. Wilson and his work. They are taken from the "Foreword" introducing Dr. Wilson's booklet as printed by the *Sunday School Times:*

Robert Dick Wilson prepared for college in the Indiana public school, and was ready for the sophomore class at Princeton when he was fourteen years old. However, he did not enter his class—the class of 1876—until he was at the advanced age of seventeen, for, as he naïvely and rather apologetically remarked: "I had a good deal of headache between my fourteenth and twentieth years, and then typhoid. After that my headache disappeared. I really couldn't half do my work before that."

In college young Wilson specialized in language, psychology, and mathematics. In such Bible courses as he then studied he says that he got "a very low grade of 90, which pulled down my average."

To him language was the gateway into alluring fields that drew him strongly. He prepared himself for college in French, German

and Greek, learned Hebrew by himself, and took a hundred dollar prize in Hebrew when he entered the seminary.

His seminary studies caused him to feel that there was a great need for a type of Biblical scholarship that was not so subjective as much of the teaching he heard, but objective and thorough in dealing with facts that could be known only by exhaustive research over the whole range of the ancient languages related to the Bible. He faced the question seriously,—should he go on in the highly attractive and necessary work of preaching in which he had been so greatly blessed, or was God calling him to years of toil in comparative obscurity and seclusion, in order to let his life count for the defense of the Scriptures on the basis of linguistic and historical facts, which only arduous and patient toil could reveal? He chose under God's guiding hand the life of the scholar, and thousands have thanked God, and other thousands will yet thank him, that this servant of his said, "Here am I; send me."

What Robert Dick Wilson then believed, and now believes with all his heart, is this: that textual and historical Biblical controversies should be taken out of the region of subjective personal opinion, into the region of objective, clearly attested fact. It was to this task that he set himself, and no labor was to be too long or too tedious or exacting to enable him to reach that goal.

He could not at that time learn Babylonian in America, so he went to Heidelberg, determined to learn every language that would enable him the better to understand the Scriptures, and to make his investigations in original documents.

So to Babylonian he added Ethiopic, Phœnician, all the Aramaic dialects, and Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, and Armenian. He studied in Berlin with Schrader, who was Delitzsch's teacher, called the father of Assyriology. He studied his Arabic and Syriac under Sachau, and Arabic under Jahn and Dieterichi; Hebrew under Dillmann and Strack, and Egyptian under Brugsch. He became conversant with some twenty-six languages in these years devoted to language acquisition.

For Professor Wilson had a plan, carefully worked out during his student days in Germany, under which he proposed to spend fifteen years in language study, fifteen years in Biblical textual study in the light of the findings of his studies in philology, and then, God willing, fifteen years of writing out his findings, so that others might share them with him. And now it is our privilege in this booklet to read, in terms that we all can understand, some of the gloriously reassuring facts that he has found in his long pilgrimage through ancient days.

Just a single glimpse of how long it has been startles the superficial and the scholarly student as well, when either learns that in order to answer a single sentence of a noted destructive critic, Professor Wilson read all the extant ancient literature of the period under discussion in numerous languages, and collated no less than one hundred thousand citations from that literature in order to get at the basic facts, which when found showed that the critic was wrong. It was largely a case of superior scholarship—in accordance with a good definition of the scholarly temperament—"that rare combination of profound insight, sustained attention, microscopic accuracy, iron tenacity, and disinterested pursuit of truth, which characterizes the great scientific discoverer or the great historian."

IS THE HIGHER CRITICISM SCHOLARLY?

THE history of the preparation of the world for the Gospel as set forth in the Old Testament is simple and clear, and in the light of the New Testament eminently reasonable. In fact, it has been considered so reasonable, so harmonious with what was to have been expected, that Christ and the apostles seem never to have doubted its veracity, and the Christian Church which they founded has up to our times accepted it as fully consonant with the facts. Within the last two centuries, however, largely as a result of the Deistical movement in England and of the application to sacred history of the so-called critical method, there has arisen a widespread doubt of the truthfulness of the Old Testament records. To such doubt many have refused to listen, and blessed are all those who have no doubts.

COUNTERING WITH PROOF, DEFENSIVE AND OFFENSIVE.

But there are many whose faith in the veracity of the Scriptures has been shaken; and the best, and in some cases the only, way to reëstablish their faith is to show them that the charges which are brought against the Bible are untrue and unwarranted.

The attempt to show this may be made along two lines. We may take the purely defensive line and endeavor to show that the general and particular attacks upon the truthfulness of the Old Testament narratives are unsupported by facts. Or, we may take the offensive and show that the Old Testament narratives are in harmony with all that is really known of the history of the world in the times described in the Old Testament records, and that these records themselves contain the ineffaceable evidence that the time and place of their origin agree with the facts

recorded. The best method, perhaps, will be to make an offensive-defensive, showing not merely that the attacks are futile, but that the events recorded and the persons and things described are true to history—that is, that they harmonize in general with what we learn from the contemporaneous documents of other nations.

This is true of the very earliest narratives of the Old Testament. Even when we look at the two great events occurring before the time of Abraham—the Creation and the Flood—we find that these events are the same that are emphasized among the Babylonians, from the midst of whom Abraham went out. For it is certain that, however we may account for the difference between the Babylonian and Hebrew accounts of the Creation and of the Deluge, there is sufficient resemblance between them to point to a common origin antedating the time of Abraham's departure from Ur of the Chaldees.[1]

The Old Testament Derived from Written Sources Based on Contemporary Documents.

From this time downward there is no good reason for doubting that the Biblical narrative is derived from *written* sources based on *contemporaneous* documents. For, first, Abraham came out of that part of Babylonia in which writing had been in use for hundreds of years; and he lived during the time of Hammurabi, from whose reign we have scores of letters, contracts, and other records, of which by far the most important is the so-called code of laws which bears his name.[2] Besides, writing had been in existence in Egypt already for two thousand years or more, so that we can well believe that the family of Abraham,

---

[1]See King, "The Seven Tablets of Creation," and Jensen, "Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen."

[2]See King, "The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi," and Harper, "The Code of Hammurabi."

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

traveling from Babylonia to Egypt and at last settling in Palestine, in between these two great literary peoples, had also formed the habit of conducting business and keeping records in writing.[3] Abraham would naturally use the cuneiform system of writing, since this is known to have existed in Western Asia long before the time of Hammurabi, and the Amarna letters show clearly that Hebrew was sometimes written in that script.[4]

But not only do we know that there was a script in which to write; we know, also, that the Hebrew language was used in Palestine before the time of Moses. This is clear not merely from more than a hundred common words embedded in the Amarna letters, but from the fact that the names of the places mentioned in them are largely Hebrew.[5] In the geographical list of the Egyptian king, Thothmes III., and of other kings of Egypt we find more than thirty good Hebrew words as the names of the cities of Palestine and Syria that they conquered.[6] From these facts we conclude that books may have been written in Hebrew at that early period. Further, we see that the sons of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob may have been called by Hebrew names, as the Biblical record assures us.[7]

Age-Long Correspondence in the Chronology of the Bible and Profane History.

Having found, then, that writing and the Hebrew language were in existence long before the time of Moses, we turn next to the documents of the Old Testament which purport to give a history, more or less connected, of the

[3]See especially Schorr, "Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozess-Rechts."

[4]See Winckler, "Tel-el-Amarna Letters," and Knudtzon, "Die El-Amarna-Tafeln."

[5]Knudtzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 1545 f.

[6]See Max Müller, "Die Palastinaliste Thutmoses III."

[7]See article "Was Abraham a Myth?" in *Bible Student and Teacher* for 1905.

period from Abraham (*circa* 2000 B.C.) to Darius II. (*circa* 400 B.C.), in order to find out, if possible, whether the general scheme of *chronology* and *geography* presented to us in the Hebrew records corresponds with what we can learn from other documents of the same period. And here we find, first, that the nations mentioned in the Scriptures as having flourished at one time or another are exactly the same as those that profane history reveals to us. Thus, in the period from Abraham to David we find in both Biblical and profane sources that Egypt is recognized as already in 2000 B.C. a great and predominant power, and that she continued to the time of Solomon to be looked upon as the great enemy of the Israelites. In the same period, we see Elam and Babylon occupying the first place in the far East, and the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Sidonians, Moabites, Edomites, and Damascus in the intervening section, in "debatable ground" between Egypt and Babylon.

In the next period, from 1000 to 625 B.C., Assyria has become the chief power among the nations in the neighborhood of Palestine, with Babylon of only secondary importance. Egypt has lost the first rank and is at times subject to Cush or dominated by Assyria. Media appears on the scene, but as a subject of Assyria. Between the Euphrates and Egypt, the Hittites are prominent in the earlier part, and next to them Hamath, Damascus, Tyre, Ammon, Moab, and Edom. Further, the distinction between Samaria and Judah is clearly recognized in the monuments.

In the last period, from 625 to 400 B.C., Babylon has become the leading power until its hegemony is taken over by Persia under Cyrus. Egypt as a world power disappears from history with the conquests by Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses. The Hittites, Damascus, Hamath, Israel, Judah, and all the tribes and cities between Babylon and Egypt have ceased to exist as independent powers.

A Foundation for Reliance.

Now, into this framework of world history, the history of Israel fits exactly. The Bible records in succession the relations of Israel with Babylon, Elam, Egypt, Hittites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians; and the smaller nations, or powers, appear in their proper relation to these successively great powers. These are facts that cannot be denied and they afford a foundation for reliance upon the statements of the Biblical documents.

Correct Order and Character of the Kings.

This foundation is strengthened when we observe that the kings of these various countries whose names are mentioned in the Old Testament are all named in the order and in the synchronism required by the documents of the kings themselves. Thus, Chedorlaomer, possibly, and certainly Hammurabi (the Amraphel of Genesis xiv.) and Arioch lived at about 2000 B.C.; Shishak, Zerah, So, Tirhakeh, Necho, and Hophra, kings of Cush and Egypt; Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, kings of Assyria; Merodach-Baladan, Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Merodach, and Belshazzar, kings of Babylon; and Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, kings of Persia, all appear in the Scriptures in their correct order as attested by their own records, or by other contemporaneous evidence. The same is true, also, of the kings of Damascus, Tyre, and Moab.

Again, we find that the Assyrian documents that mention the kings of Israel and Judah name them in the same order in which they appear in the chronicles of Israel and Judah. And not only this. We find, also, that the statements made with regard to the kings of all these countries correspond as closely as different documents ever correspond in reference to their relative power, importance, and characteristics and deeds. Especially noteworthy are the

close resemblances in this respect between the accounts of Shishak, Tiglath-Pileser, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, and Cyrus; but the whole fabric of the historic structure of the Old Testament harmonizes beautifully in general outline and often in detail with the background of the general history of the world as revealed in the documents from the nations surrounding Israel.

A Biblical Phenomenon Unequaled in the History of Literature.

Moreover, an extraordinary confirmation of the careful transmission of the Hebrew documents from original sources lies in the exact manner in which the names of the kings are spelled. The twenty-four names of kings of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, *et al.*, contain 120 consonantal letters, of which all are found in the same order in the inscriptions of the kings themselves or in those of their contemporaries. That the Hebrew writers should have transliterated these names with such accurateness and conformity to philological principles is a wonderful proof of their thorough care and scholarship and of their access to the original sources. That the names should have been transmitted to us through so many copyings and so many centuries in so complete a state of preservation is a phenomenon unequaled in the history of literature. The scribe of Assurbanipal in transcribing the name of Psammetichus, the contemporary king of Egypt, makes the mistake of writing a *t* for the *p* at the beginning and an *l* for the *t* in the middle.[8] Abulfeda, the author of the Arab ante-Islamic history, gives the names of the kings of Persia of the Achæmenid line as "Kei-Kobad, Kei-kawus, Kei-Chosrew, Kei-Lohrasp, Kei-Bushtasf, Kei-Ardeshir-Bahman and Chomani his daughter, and Dara the First, and

[8]See "Annals of Assurbanipal," Col. ii. 114, and Streck's "Assurbanipal," p. 715.

Dara the Second who was killed by Alaskander," and writes the name of Nebuchadnezzar as Bactnosar. In the list of names of the companions of Alexander given by the Pseudo-Callisthenes, nearly every name is changed so as to be unrecognizable;[9] and the same is true of most of the names of the kings of Egypt as we have them preserved in the lists of Manetho, Herodotus, and Diodorus Siculus, and of the kings of Assyria and Babylonia as given in Africanus, Castor, and the Canon of Ptolemy.[10]

The Correctness of Hebrew Authors a Basis for Faith.

This almost universal inaccuracy and unreliability of the Greek and Arab historians with reference to the kings of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon is in glaring contrast with the exactness and trustworthiness of the Hebrew Bible. It can be accounted for, humanly speaking, only on the grounds that the authors of the Hebrew records were contemporaries of the kings they mention, or had access to original documents; and secondly, that the Hebrew writers were good enough scholars to transliterate with exactness; and thirdly, that the copyists of the Hebrew originals transcribed with conscientious care the text that was before them. Having given such care to the names of heathen kings, it is to be presumed that they would give no less attention to what these kings said and did; and so we have in this incontestable evidence from the order, times, and spelling of the names of the kings an indestructible basis upon which to rest our faith in the reliability of the history recorded in the books of the Old Testament Scriptures.

---

[9]See President Woolsey in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. III., pp. 359–440.

[10]See Cory, "Ancient Fragments," and Müller, "Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum," and article on "Darius the Mede," by R.D. Wilson, in *Princeton Theological Review*, April, 1922.

Doubt about some of the minor details can never invalidate this strong foundation of facts upon which to erect the enduring structure of the history of Israel.

Having secured a framework for our history, let us look next at the doorways of language which let us inside the structure. These doorways are the passages through which converse with the outer world was carried on by the people of Israel. On their thresholds will be seen the footprints of the nations who introduced their ideas and their products to the household who dwelt within.

Intruding Foreign Words as Date-Setters.

In order that the force of the evidence that I am about to produce may be fully appreciated, let me here say that the time at which any document of length, and often even of small compass, was written can generally be determined by the character of its vocabulary, and especially by the foreign words which are embedded in it. Take, for example, the various Aramaic documents. The inscriptions from Northern Syria having been written in Assyrian times bear evident marks of Assyrian, Phœnician, and even Hebrew words.[11] The Egyptian papyri from Persian times have numerous words of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian origin, as have also the Aramaic parts of Ezra and Daniel.[12] The Nabatean Aramaic having been written probably by Arabs is strongly marked, especially in its proper names, by Arab words.[13] The Palmyrene, Syriac, and Rabbinical Aramaic, from the time of the Græco-Roman domination, have hundreds of terms introduced

---

[11]See Lidzbarski, "Nordsemitische Epigraphik," and Cooke, "North Semitic Inscriptions."

[12]See Sayce-Cowley, "Papyri;" Sachau, "Papyrus;" and Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris* for 1911.

[13]See Euting, "Sinaitische Inschriften," and the "Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum," Vol. II.

from Greek and Latin.[14] Bar Hebræus and other writings after the Mohammedan conquest have numerous Arabic expressions, and the modern Syriac of Ouroumiah has many words of Persian, Kurdish, and Turkish origin.[15]

The Ever-Changing Influx of New Words in Hebrew Scriptures.

Now, if the Biblical history be true, we shall expect to find Babylonian words in the early chapters of Genesis and Egyptian in the later; and so on down, an ever-changing influx of new words from the languages of the ever-changing dominating powers. And, as a matter of fact, this is exactly what we find. The accounts of the Creation and the Flood are marked by Babylonian words and ideas. The record of Joseph is tinged with an Egyptian coloring. The language of Solomon's time has Indian, Assyrian, and probably Hittite words. From his time to the end of the Old Testament, Assyrian and Babylonian terms are often found, as in Jeremiah, Nahum, Isaiah, Kings, and other books. Persian words come in first with the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus and are frequent in Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and Esther, and, in the case of proper names, one at least occurs in both Haggai and Zechariah. No Greek words are to be found in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, except Javan and possibly one or two other terms. That Aramaic words may have been in Hebrew documents at any time from Moses to Ezra is shown by the fact that two or more words and phrases found elsewhere only in Aramaic occur already in the Tel-el-Amarna letters, and one in a letter to the king of Egypt from Abd-Hiba of Jerusalem.[16]

---

[14]See Lidzbarski and Cooke as cited in Note 11; Brockelmann, "Lexicon Syriacum," and Dalman, "Aramaisch-neuhebraisches Worterbuch."

[15]See Brockelmann, "Lexicon Syriacum," and MacLean, "Dictionary of Vernacular Syriac."

[16]See Winckler and Knudtzon as cited in Note 4.

It may be known to the reader that one verse in Jeremiah and about half of the books of Ezra and Daniel are written in Aramaic. This is what we might have expected at a time when, as the Egyptian papyri[17] and the Babylonian indorsements[18] show, the Aramaic language had become the common language of Western Asia and in particular of the Jews, at least in all matters of business and commerce. That the Hebrew parts of Daniel and Ezra should have a large number of Aramaic words would, therefore, be expected; and, also, they would naturally be found in Chronicles and Nehemiah and other documents coming from the latter part of the sixth century (when Aramaic was the *lingua franca* of the Persian empire) and in other works down to the latest composition of the Old Testament. In later Hebrew this process of absorbing foreign words may be illustrated by numerous examples. Thus the tract *Yoma*, written about A.D. 200, has about twenty Greek words in it, and *Pesahim*, about fourteen, while hundreds of them are found in Dalman's dictionary of New Hebrew. Many terms of Latin origin also appear in the Hebrew literature of Roman times.

No Whit Different from Our Own Language To-Day.

We thus see that the Hebrew, just like the Aramaic, has embedded in it traces of the nations that influenced its history from 2000 B.C. to A.D. 1500, or indeed to the present time. The reader will compare this with the marks which have been left upon our American nomenclature by the different nations that have influenced its history. The native Indian appears in the names Massachusetts, Connecticut, Allegheny, Ohio, Mexico, Yucatan, and countless other terms. The Spanish appears in Florida, San Ansel-

---

[17]See Sayce-Cowley, "Papyri," and Sachau, "Papyrus."

[18]See article by A. T. Clay in "The W. R. Harper Memorial Volume."

mo, Los Angeles, Vera Cruz, New Granada, and numerous appellations of mountains, rivers, and cities; the French, in Montreal, Detroit, Vincennes, Duquesne, Louisiana, St. Louis, and New Orleans; the Dutch, in Hackensack, Schenectady, Schuyler; the German, in Germantown, and Snyder County (Pennsylvania). Some of these languages have contributed, also, various words of common use, such as moccasin, succotash, potato, maize, tomato, tomahawk, prairie, sauerkraut, broncho, and corral.

These languages all have left their mark, but the great directing, predominating language and nation were the English, as is shown not merely in our literature and laws, but also in such names as New Hampshire, Boston, New York, Albany, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, and the names of most of our cities, counties, and statesmen. But that the English received their laws largely from the Romans and the Normans is evident in any law book or court room; that they received their religion from the Hebrews through the Greek and Latin churches is evident from the words we use every day, such as amen, hallelujah, priest, baptism, cathedral, bishop, chant, cross, resurrection, glory, and countless others.

Critics Undervalue the Totality of the Evidence.

Thus, the vicissitudes of the life of the English people for the last fifteen hundred years can be traced in the foreign words that have been taken over into its literature during that period. So also with the Hebrew people for the last four thousand years, and in the first part of sixteen hundred years no less than since that time. And in the study of the Hebrew literature in the light of the foreign elements that are embedded in it, we find that the truthfulness of the history is incidentally but convincingly confirmed. In each stage of the literature the foreign words in the documents are found to belong to the language of the peoples that the Scriptures and the records of the nations surrounding Israel

unite in declaring to have influenced and affected the Israelites at that time. The critics of the Old Testament have never given sufficient weight to the totality of this evidence.

That the presence of Babylonian terms in the first chapter of Genesis points to a time when Babylonian influence was predominant, no one will dispute; but the same influence is manifest in the second chapter and also in Daniel. This influence can easily be accounted for in all three instances on the supposition that the contents of Genesis i. and ii. were brought by Abraham from Babylon and that the book of Daniel was written at Babylon in the sixth century B.C. While it might be accounted for in Genesis i. if it were composed at Babylon during or after the exile, how can it have influenced Genesis ii. if, as the critics assert, it were written somewhere between 800 and 750 B.C.? How, also, can we account for the Babylonian influence in Daniel if, as the same critics assure us, it were written in Palestine in 164 B.C.?

Why Are Persian Words Missing in Critic-Belated Bible Books?

So of the Persian words. They are found especially in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel, all ostensibly from the Persian period of world domination. According to analogy, this Persian domination accounts for their presence in these books. But how about their absence from Jonah, Joel, Job, the Psalms, the Song of Songs, the so-called Priest-Code of the Pentateuch and other writings which the critics place in the Persian period? Why especially should the Priest-Code have no Persian, and probably no Aramaic, words, if it were written between 500 and 300 B.C., in the very age and, as some affirm, by the very author of the book of Ezra? And why should the only demonstrably Babylonian words in this part of the Pentateuch be found in the accounts of the

Creation and the Flood, which may so well have come with Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees? And how could the word for "kind" (*min*), an Egyptian word, have come to be used by the man who is supposed to have written this latest part of the Pentateuch in Babylon in the fifth century B.C.?

These and other similar questions that ought to be asked we may leave to the critics of the Old Testament to attempt to answer. They dare not deny the facts without laying themselves open to the charge of ignorance. They dare not ignore them without submitting to the charge of willful suppression of the facts in evidence.

But some one will say: How about the Greek words in Daniel? No one claims that there are any Greek words in the Hebrew of Daniel. In the Aramaic parts of Daniel there are three words, all names of musical instruments, which are alleged, *not proved*, to be Greek. It is more likely than not, I think, that they are of Greek origin, though no one of them is exactly transliterated. Assuming, however, that they are Greek, and waiving the question as to whether this part of the book was originally written in Hebrew, or Babylonian, and afterwards translated into Aramaic, there is no good reason for supposing that Greek musical instruments, retaining their original names though in a somewhat perverted form, may not have been used at the court of Nebuchadnezzar.

How Greek Words May Have Crept into Daniel.

It is known for a certainty that from the earliest times the kings and peoples of Babylon and Nineveh delighted in music. Now, the Greeks, according to all their traditions and habits, both in war and worship, had practiced music at all periods of their history and far excelled all ancient peoples in their attainments in the art of music. We all know how readily musical instruments and their native names travel from land to land. We might instance the

ukelele, the guitar, the organ, and the trumpet. The Greeks themselves imported many foreign musical instruments which retained their foreign names. From at least 1000 B.C. there was an active commerce between the Greeks and the Semites. Cyprus and Cilicia were subdued by the Assyrian kings; and Sennacherib about 700 B.C. conquered a Greek fleet and carried many prisoners captive to Nineveh. Assurbanipal received the homage of Gyges, king of Lydia, the neighbor and overlord of many Greek cities in Asia Minor.

Greeks had been settled in Egypt since long before the time of Assurbanipal and Nebuchadnezzar and served as mercenaries in the armies of the Egyptian kings who were subdued by the great kings of Nineveh and Babylon, and also in the army of Nebuchadnezzar himself. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of captive Greek soldiers would, according to the custom of those days, be settled in the cities of the Euphrates and Tigris valleys. And these valleys were filled with people who spoke Aramaic. The Greeks would mingle with them and, as in the case of the Jews at Babylon, the natives would ask of them a song; and they would sing their strange songs to the accompaniment of their native instruments. This is one way in which the instruments and their names could get into Aramaic long before the time when the Aramaic of Daniel was written. Another was through the slaves, both men and girls, who would certainly be brought from all lands to minister to the pleasures of the luxurious court of the Chaldean king.

Why Daniel May Have Used Persian Words.

That Daniel may have used the so-called Persian words in a document dating from the latter part of the sixth century B.C. is manifest when we remember that the children of Israel from the kingdom of Samaria had been captive among the Medes for two hundred years before the

time of the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, and that the Jews had been carried to the banks of the Chebar and other localities where Aramaic was spoken nearly two generations before Daniel died. The Medes spoke a dialect of the Persian, and, having overthrown Nineveh in 606 B.C., had ruled over large numbers of Aramæan tribes on the upper Tigris ever since that time. Such Medo-Persian terms as are found in Daniel, being mostly official titles like governor and names of persons, are the ones which would most readily be adopted by the subject nations, including the Aramæans and Jews. That the words satrap and Xerxes were taken directly from the Medo-Persian and not from the Greek is shown by the fact that the Hebrew and Aramaic spelling of these names in Daniel is exactly the equivalent of that in the original language and not such as it must have been if these words had been taken over indirectly through the Greek historians.

Before leaving this subject of language, attention must be called to two matters that the critics have made of supreme importance in their attempts to settle the dates of the documents of the Old Testament. The first matter is that of the value, as evidence of date of the occurrence, of Aramaic words in a Hebrew document; and the second is the value, as evidence of date, of Hebrew words that occur but once, or at most a few times, in the Old Testament and that reoccur in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

Hebraisms in Aramaic, Not Aramaisms in Hebrew.

As to the first of these, the so-called Aramaisms, the number has been grossly exaggerated. Many of the words and roots formerly called Aramaisms have been found in Babylonian records as early as Abraham. As to the remainder, many of them occur in the Old Testament but once. In view of the fact that there are about 1,500 words used but once in the Old Testament, it is impossible to select some of these and call them Aramaisms,

simply because they are used in Aramaic also. Hundreds of words in both Aramaic and Hebrew, and also in Babylonian and Arabic, have the same meaning irrespective of the number of times or the documents in which they occur. According to the laws of consonantal change existing among the Semitic languages, not more than five or six Aramaic roots can be shown to have been adopted by the Hebrew from the Aramaic. These roots are found in what the critics class as early documents as well as in the later. Besides, a large proportion of the words designated as Aramaisms do not occur in any Aramaic dialect except those that were spoken by Jews. In all such cases the probability is that instead of the word's being an Aramaism in Hebrew, it is a Hebraism in Aramaic. For the Hebrew documents in all such cases antedate the Aramaic by hundreds of years; and it is evident that the earlier cannot have been derived from the later.

Again, the critics find words which they call Aramaisms not merely in the books which they assert to be late, but in those that, according to their own dating, are the earliest. In this case, without any evidence except their own theory of how it ought to be, they charge that the original text has been changed and the Aramaic word inserted. Such procedure is contrary to all the laws of evidence, fairness, and common sense. For there is no reason why the early documents of the Hebrews should not have contained linguistic marks of Aramaic influence. According to Genesis xxxi., Laban spoke Aramaic. David conquered Damascus and other cities where Aramaic was spoken and the Israelites have certainly been in continuous contact with Aramæan tribes from that time to the present. Sporadic cases of the use of Aramaic words would, therefore, prove nothing as to the date of a Hebrew document.

A Theory That Would Make All Documents Late.

In the second place, critics who are attempting to prove the late date of a certain document are wont to cite the words in that document which occur nowhere else, except possibly in another work claimed as being late, and in the Hebrew of the Talmud. Such evidence is worthy of being collected in order to show the peculiarities of an author, but it does not necessarily have anything to do with proving the date. For there are three thousand words in the Old Testament that occur five times only or under, and fifteen hundred that occur but once. Besides, such words occurring elsewhere in the Talmud are found in every book of the Old Testament and in almost every chapter. If such words were proof of the lateness of a document, all documents would be late; a conclusion so absurd as to be held by nobody.

Hebrew Literary Forms Duplicated in Babylon and Egypt.

From the language of the Old Testament we naturally turn next to the literature, in order to see if the literary forms in which the documents are written are such as we would expect to find in existence when the documents lay claim to have been written. Our only evidence here must be derived from comparative literature and contemporary history.[19] Turning, then, to the vast body of the literatures of the Babylonians and Egyptians we find that in one, or both, of them is to be found every type of literary form that is met with in the literature of the Old Testament; except perhaps the discourses of the prophets. As no serious dispute of the date, or authorship, of the works of the prophets is made on the ground of mere literary form,

---

[19]See further on this subject in article by R. D. Wilson on "Scientific Biblical Criticism," in the *Princeton Theological Review* for 1919.

the general statement will stand unimpeached; for poetry, history, laws, and biographies are all amply duplicated in form and style in the many productions of the great nations that surrounded Israel.

The Same True of Legal Forms.

With regard to the laws it may be said that, not merely in the form in which the individual laws are stated, but also in the manner in which they are collected together in a kind of code, there was a pattern for the Israelites already existing at least from the time of Hammurabi, a contemporary of Abraham. This code of Hammurabi, it is true, deals almost entirely with civil and criminal laws such as we find in parts of Deuteronomy. But the plan of the tabernacle in Exodus xxv.–xxix. may be likened to the plans of the Babylonian temples which were placed in their foundation stones, to which Nebuchadnezzar and Nabunaid so often refer. Laws similar to those concerning leprosy and other diseases have also come down from the old Sumerians. It is almost certain, also, that the elaborate ceremonies of the Egyptian and Babylonian temples must have been regulated by written laws, though thus far we have discovered no complete code treating of such matters.

That Moses with his education in all the wisdom of the Egyptians at 1500 B.C. might have produced the laws of the Pentateuch under the divine guidance seems beyond dispute. Lycurgus, Mohammed, Charlemagne, Peter the Great, and Napoleon have performed similar feats without any special divine help. It does not follow that systems of law and constitutions were not written, or inaugurated, because they were never carried out nor permanently established. Theodoric and Alfred the Great and even Charlemagne organized governments which scarcely survived their demise. The critics are in the habit of stressing the fact that so little mention of the law is made

in the period before Hezekiah, or even Josiah, and assert that the law of the Priest-code was not fully established before Ezra.

An Argument from Silence Which Proves Nothing.

This is an argument from silence which proves nothing absolutely. There is a history of the United States called "Scribner's," by William Cullen Bryant and others. It has 53 pages, double column, of Index. The word "Presbyterian" does not occur in this Index; the word "Christian" only in the phrase, Christian Commission; the word "church" only twice. And yet, this is a history of a republic founded by Christians, observing the Sabbath, devoted to foreign missions, and full of Christian churches and activities. Thirty-five hundred pages quarto and no mention of Thanksgiving Day, nor of the days of fasting and prayer during the Civil War, nor of the Bible except in the relation of the Bible Society to slavery!

Nor does it prove that the law did not exist, to show that it was not completely observed, or that things forbidden in it were done. Does the crime wave that has been sweeping the world since the close of the war prove that the Gospel does not exist? In one week of December, 1920, the front page of one of our great New York dailies had scarcely space for anything except reports of murders, burglaries, and other crimes. Are the Ten Commandments unknown in New York City?

But the critics assert that a long period of development was necessary before such a system of laws could have been formulated, accepted, and enforced. I agree readily to this; but I claim that all the development necessary for the formulation may have taken place before the time of Moses and that its hearty acceptance by the people and its enforcement depended upon moral rather than intellectual conditions. As far as intellectual requirements are concerned, there is nothing in the law that might not have

been written either in Babylon or Egypt a thousand years before Moses. Then as now it was spiritual power and moral inclination that was wanted rather than intellectual perception in order to do the right and abhor the wrong. In each successive generation of Israelitish men each individual of the nation had to be converted and to submit his soul and conduct to the teachings of the divine law. The ancient Jewish Church had its ups and downs, its times of strenuous faith and of declension and decay, just as the Christian Church has had.

Ample Time for Revision of Laws.

It is claimed by the critics that signs of progress, or change, are to be observed in some of the laws as given in Exodus xx.–xxiv., Leviticus, and Deuteronomy. This may be admitted. It is, however, a sufficient answer to this claim that in the forty years from the arrival at Sinai to the final address of Moses at Shittim, there was plenty of time for revision and adaptation of these laws to suit all probable variety of circumstances awaiting the people of God. Consider the changes in forty years in the fish laws of Pennsylvania, or in the tariff or railroad legislation of the United States! Besides, many of these apparently variant legislations with regard to the same thing are, as Mr. Wiener has so clearly shown in his "Studies in Biblical Law," really laws affecting different relations of the same thing. Some, also, like the Income Tax Laws upon our yearly declaration sheet, are general laws for the whole people; while others, like the detailed statements of the Income Tax Law that are meant to guide the tax officials, are meant for the priests and Levites who officiated at the sanctuary.

That there should be repetitions of the laws affecting the Sabbath, festivals, idolatry, and so forth, does not argue against unity of authorship. The central facts of a new system are frequently emphasized by such repetition, as is

manifest in almost every chapter of the Koran, and in almost every epistle of the apostle Paul. Why they thus repeat is not always clear to us; but it is to be supposed that it was clear to the authors of the repetitions. That is a question of motives and not of text or evidence. What the Peace Treaty says is evident; why the treaty-makers said thus and so is not always apparent, and cannot be produced in evidence.

Were the "Redactors" Slipshod Editors?

That there should be *apparent* contradictions among so many laws was inevitable. Some of these are doubtless due to errors of transmission, especially if, as seems probable, the original was written in cuneiform and afterwards transferred to an alphabetic system of writing. Some of them appear contradictory, but really relate to different persons or circumstances. Certainly, if they were as contradictory and irreconcilable as the critics suppose, we have a right to express our astonishment that such contradictions were not removed by one or another of those numerous and canny redactors, editors, and *diaskeuasts* (revisers), of unknown but blessed memory, whom the critics allege and assume to have labored for centuries upon the elaboration of these laws. Surely, these alleged contradictions cannot have escaped their notice. Surely, they cannot have seemed incongruous to the priests of the second temple and to the Scribes and Pharisees who put them into execution. Surely, if real contradictions exist in the laws it is more likely that they were not in the ancient documents and that they arose in the process of transmission through the vicissitudes of many centuries, than that they should have been inserted in the time of Jeremiah, or of Ezra, that ready scribe in the Law of Moses.

Will Objectors Please Answer a Few Questions?

Before leaving the matter of the law, it may be well to propose for the consideration of the objectors to the Biblical account of the origin of the laws of Moses a few questions that, it seems to me, require an answer before we can accept their theory of its origin, unsupported as it is by any direct evidence.

First, if Exodus xx.–xxiv. and Deuteronomy were written in the period of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, how can we account for the fact that the king is referred to but once (Deuteronomy xvi.), and that in a passage difficult to read and explain and claiming to be anticipatory? And why should this passage make no reference to the house of David, and place its emphasis on a warning against a return to Egypt?

Second, why should the law never mention Zion, or Jerusalem, as the place where men ought to worship, if these laws were written hundreds of years after the temple had been built?

Third, why should the temple itself receive no consideration, but be set aside for a "mythical" tabernacle whose plan to the minutest particular has been elaborated with so much care? And why, if this plan were devised at Babylon in the fifth century B.C., should it in its form and divisions show more resemblance to an Egyptian than to a Babylonian house of God?

Why the Emphasis on the Shedding of Blood?

Fourth, if the laws of the Priest-code were made at Babylon, how does it come about that the main emphasis in these laws is upon the shedding of blood and that the principal offerings are bloody offerings; whereas, in the Babylonian religion it is doubtful if any reference is ever made to the importance of the blood and no word corresponding to the Hebrew word for altar (*mizbeach*) has ever yet been found in the Babylonian language? How is

it, also, that almost the entire vocabulary bearing upon the ceremonial observances is different in Babylonian from what it is in Hebrew? The Hebrew names for the various articles of clothing worn by the priests, for the stones of the breastplate, for the sacrifices, for the altar and the many spoons and other implements used in its service, for the festivals, for the ark and the multifarious articles used in its construction, for sins and removal of sins, and for nearly all the gracious acts of God in redemption, differ almost altogether from the Babylonian. How account for all this, if the ceremonies of the second temple were first conceived by the rivers of Babylon under the shadow of the tower of Bel?

Ezra s Careful Camouflage!

Fifth, if the ceremonial law were written between 500 and 300 B.C., at a time when the Persian power was supreme, how account for the entire absence of Persian words and customs from the priestly document? Why should Ezra and his contemporaries have used so many Persian words in their other compositions and have utterly eschewed them in the lengthiest of their works? Not one Persian word, forsooth! How careful they must have been in this endeavor to camouflage their attempt to foist their work on Moses! They should have spent more of their time and energy on the removal of alleged incongruities in the subject matter.

Sixth, if the Israelitish religion is a natural development like that of the nations that surrounded them, how does it happen that the Phœnicians who spoke substantially the same language have an almost entirely different nomenclature for their ceremonial acts, for sacrifices and the material of sacrifice; and that the Phœnicians and Carthaginians and their colonies remained polytheistic to the last?

Seventh, if the ceremonial law were written after the

exile, when all the Jews, from Elephantine in Egypt on the west to Babylon on the east, were speaking and writing Aramaic, how did it come to pass that the law was written in a Hebrew so different from anything found in any Aramaic dialect that almost every word used in it required to be translated in order to make it understood by the Aramaic-speaking Jews? Are we to suppose that the exiled Hebrews invented their religious vocabulary arbitrarily after their language had ceased to be spoken by any great body of living men? Are we to suppose that they invented, or borrowed, the names of the stones of the breastplate, and then forgot so completely their Aramaic equivalents that scarcely any two of the four Aramaic targums, or versions, should afterwards be able to agree as to the meaning in Aramaic of more than two or three of them at most? Why, also, should the articles of dress, the names of the sacrifices, the materials of the tabernacle, the verbs to denote the ceremonial acts, and in fact the general coloring and the particular shades of the coloring of the whole fabric be so different?

Eighth, how is the fact to be explained that the Aramaic of the Targum and Talmud has taken over so many roots and vocables from the Hebrew of the Old Testament? For a comparison of the Old Testament Hebrew with the Aramaic of the Targums and of both these with the Syriac shows that about six hundred roots and words found in the two former do not appear in Syriac, nor in any other Aramaic dialect not written by Jews. The critics are in the habit of charging that such words are Aramaisms in Hebrew; but it is manifest that, while it is possible for the Jews who wrote Aramaic two hundred years after Christ to have taken over Hebrew words from the Old Testament into their translations and commentaries, it would have been impossible for Hebrew authors living from two hundred to five hundred years before Christ to have taken over into their vocabulary Aramaic words not in use till A.D.

200, or later. All of the "Introductions" to the Old Testament need to be revised along this line.

"To the Text and to the Testimony!"

That a word occurs in the Old Testament but once and then reappears five hundred or a thousand years later in an Aramaic document written by Jews is to be expected. To say that such a word may have been in the spoken Aramaic before ever the Hebrew document was written, but that it did not appear in writing till A.D. 200, may be met by affirming that it may have existed in the spoken Hebrew for a thousand years before it was written. When we once attempt to argue on the basis of what is not contained in documents, one man's conjecture is just about as good as another's. I am willing to leave all such cases to the written testimony found in the documents we possess, and I demand that the assailants of the Scriptures confine themselves in like manner to that which has been written. To the text and to the testimony! By these let us stand or fall.

Why Do the Critics Reject Chronicles?

Leaving the consideration of the Law of Moses, I pass on next to the regulations which David is said to have formulated for the guidance of the priests in the service of the sanctuary and especially for the musical accompaniments of worship. It will be necessary in the course of this discussion to examine the reasons why the critics reject the historical character of the books of Chronicles which refer so often to the music of the first temple.[20] Since the Chronicler refers only to regulations made by David for the divisions of the priests and of singers, and the like, it is to be presumed that regulations with regard to other matters connected with the service were already in use.

---

[20]For a further discussion of Chronicles, see article referred to in Note 19.

That a temple was actually built by David and Solomon on Mount Zion at Jerusalem no man surely would deny. The whole after history of both Israel and Judah turns upon that fact. The analogy of all other ancient nations and the whole literature of the Israelites proves beyond question that such a temple must have been constructed.

Now, when this temple was first built, all that would be necessary would be to take over the priests and the ritual already in existence and vary them only in so far as was required to meet the new conditions of an enlarged and more dignified place of worship. The old priesthood of the temple at Shiloh and the old laws of the tabernacle with reference to sacrifices and festivals would be found sufficient; but to make the service more efficient and suitable to the great glory of the magnificent house that had been erected for the God of Israel, certain new regulations as to the time and manner of the services were instituted by David. Whatever is not referred to as having originated with him must be presumed to have been already in existence.

Since David and Solomon built the temple, it is common sense to suppose that they organized the priests into regular orders for the orderly service of the sanctuary. These priests had already had their clothing prescirbed by Moses after the analogy of the Egyptian and all other orders of priesthood the world over. He also had prescribed the kinds and times of offerings and the purpose for which they were offered. The Israelites, also, like the Egyptians and Babylonians, had for their festive occasions such regulations as are attributed to David for the observance of these festivals, so as to avoid confusion and to preserve decency in the house of God.

An Inconsistent Theory Made to Fit.

Is it to be supposed that on these festive occasions no music was to be employed and no hymns of praise to God

to be sung? Even the most savage tribes have music at their festivals and we know that the ancient Egyptians had numerous hymns to Amon and other gods, and that the Assyrians and Babylonians, and even the Sumerians before them, delighted in singing psalms of praise and penitence as a part of their ritual of worship. These hymns in all cases were accompanied by instrumental music. Some of the Babylonian and Egyptian hymns were current in writing for hundreds, or even thousands, of years before the time of Solomon; and some musical instruments had existed for the same length of time. Are we to suppose that the Hebrews alone among the nations of antiquity had no vocal and instrumental music in their temple services? The critics maintain that poetry is the earliest form of expression of a people's thoughts and history. Many of them assert that the song of Deborah antedates all other literary productions in the Bible. Most of them will admit that David composed the lament over Saul and Jonathan.

But they draw the line at his Psalms of praise and penitence. Why? Because it suits their theory that the Psalms were prepared for use in the second temple. They hold at the same time that certain poems, like the songs of Deborah and Miriam and the blessings of Jacob and Moses, antedate by centuries the historical narratives in which they are found, but that the Psalms were all, or nearly all, composed after the captivity. What grounds have they for holding such seemingly inconsistent theories? Absolutely none that is based on any evidence, unless the wish to have it so, in order to bolster up their conception of the history of Israel's religion, be called evidence. We all know into what condition the German conception that the "will to power" is the same as the power itself has brought the world to-day. Let us remember that it is the German conception that the will to have the text of the Old Testament what they want to have it is considered by

them to be the same as having the text the same as they will it to be. The "willing" the power has destroyed what power there really was; the "willing" the text has destroyed the text itself.

Psalm Writers Would Not Have Absurdly Attributed Their Work to Pre-Captivity Authors.

Of course, it is obvious that music is mentioned in the books of Kings; but it is made prominent in Chronicles, and the headings of many of the Psalms attribute them to David and in three cases to Moses and Solomon. It is hardly to be supposed that the writer would have made his work absurd by making statements that his contemporaries would have known to be untrue. Whether the headings are all trustworthy, or not, it is absurd to suppose that the writers of them would have attributed so many of the Psalms to pre-captivity authors, when their contemporaries must have known that the whole body of Psalms had arisen after the fall of the first temple, had such been actually the case. The most natural supposition would be that David either made or collected a sufficient number of Psalms to meet the requirements of the temple worship.

Common sense and universal analogy compel us to believe, also, that an orderly worship conducted by priests in accordance with prescribed regulations and a service of song commensurate with the dignity and decency becoming the house of God must have existed among the Hebrews, certainly from the time that the first temple was constructed and probably from the time that the tabernacle was erected and the annual festivals established. Historians of royal courts, of diplomacy and war, like the author of the books of Kings, may not mention such things; but we may be sure that they existed. The temple itself proves this. Universal experience proves it. The weeping stone at the foundation of the temple, where the Jews of to-day congregate to bewail the long departed glories of

Mount Zion and the glorious house of Israel's God, testifies that the traditions about the sweet Psalmist of Israel were not all figments of the imagination, nor mythical creations of later times.

Besides, why should the critics treat the books of Chronicles as if their statements, additional to those in Kings, were not to be credited? They assert that the genealogical list in 1 Chronicles iii. 17–24 would bring down the date of the composition of Chronicles to about 300 B.C., and that we cannot rely upon the statements of a work written so long after the events recorded. But, at the same time, they all agree that the text of this passage has not been correctly transmitted and that its interpretation admits of the sixth generation after Zerubbabel as the period of its composition. As the word *son* in all such genealogies means successor, whether it be a real son, an adopted son, or an official successor, it is fair, judging by the analogy of other similar lists, to suppose that from fifteen to twenty years would be amply sufficient for each generation of priests, or kings. Since Zerubbabel lived about 520 B.C., such a calculation would bring the date of Chronicles to about 400 B.C.

The "Jaddua" of Chronicles and of Josephus Not Necessarily the Same.

That the mention of Jaddua as high priest renders this date impossible, cannot be maintained for the following reasons: First, it is supposed that the Jaddua mentioned in Nehemiah xii. 11, 22 is the same as the Jaddua mentioned by Josephus as having been high priest when Alexander came up to Jerusalem in 336 B.C. But the critics themselves assert that this account of Alexander's visit is utterly unreliable. Why then should they consider the name and the time of the high priesthood of Jaddua to be the only valid date of the account given by Josephus

and that they alone are reliable enough to overthrow the accepted date of Chronicles?

Besides, there may have been two high priests of the name of Jaddua, just as, between 300 and 100 B.C., there were two or three of the name of Simon and six of the name of Onias. Or the same Jaddua may have been high priest at 400 B.C., and also in 336 B.C. Josephus says he was very old, and men in such positions not infrequently reach ninety, or more, years of age. I, myself, had a great-grandfather and a great-uncle who lived to be over a hundred, a great-grandmother who was ninety-nine, one great-uncle ninety-four, another ninety-two. Besides, my mother died at eighty, and half a dozen uncles and aunts between eighty and ninety years of age. Every one of these was old enough and active enough to have been high priest for sixty-five years, and several of them for eighty years, had they lived in the times of the Chronicles, and been eligible to the office.

Ewald Utterly Refuted in the Argument Regarding the Title "King of Persia."

Second, the critics affirm that Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles were put together in their present form by the same redactor and that this redactor must have lived in the Greek period, because he calls the kings of Persia by the title "king of Persia." The great German critic, Ewald, said it was "unnecessary and contrary to contemporary usage" to call the kings of Persia by the title "king of Persia" during the time that the kings of Persia actually ruled; and that consequently the presence of this title in a document shows that the document must have been written after the Persian empire had ceased to exist. The present writer has shown by a complete induction of all the titles of the kings of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Greece, and all the other nations of that part of the world including the Hebrews themselves, from 4000 B.C. down to Au-

gustus, that it was the custom in all times, languages, and kingdoms to use titles similar to this.[21] Further, he has shown that the title "king of Persia" was given by Nabunaid, king of Babylon, to Cyrus in 546 B.C., seven years before the first use of it in the Bible, and that it is used by Xenophon in 365 B.C., probably forty years after it is used for the last time in the Bible. Further, he has shown that, between 546 and 365 B.C., it was used thirty-eight different times by eighteen different authors, in nineteen different documents, in six different languages, and in five or six different countries; and that it is used in letters and dates in Scripture just as it is used in the extra-Biblical documents. Lastly, he has shown that it was not usual for the Greek authors after the Persian period to employ the title.[22]

Inexcusable Ignorance of Evidence on the Part of Notable Critics Exposed.

Thus, with regard to this title, by a mass of incontestable evidence, the writers of Chronicles and Ezra, and of Daniel, also, are shown to be in harmony with the contemporaneous usage of documents written in the Persian period and to be out of harmony with the common usage in Greek times. The Bible is right, and Professor Ewald of Göttingen, the greatest German Old Testament scholar of his time, and Professors Driver and Gray of Oxford, the writers of many books and of many articles in the Encyclopedia Britannica, Hastings, and the *Expository Times*, are proved to be wrong. They all might have read that part of the evidence which is found in Herodotus, Thucydides, Æschylus, Xenophon, and other Greek authors.

---

[21]See articles by R. D. Wilson on "The Titles of Kings in Ancient Times," in the *Princeton Theological Review* for 1905–06.

[22]See article by R. D. Wilson in the *Festschrift Edouard Sachau*, Berlin, 1911.

Drs. Driver and Gray ought, also, to have read for themselves, or to have had Professor Sayce, or Dr. King, or Dr. Budge, read or gather for them the evidence on the subject to be found in the Babylonian, Persian, Susian, and Egyptian. Unless one has sufficiently mastered the languages in which the texts containing the evidence on such subjects as the titles of the kings of Persia are written, he cannot be called an expert witness and should be ruled out of court.

Having read carefully and repeatedly what these critics have to say on this title, I have failed to find any hint indicating that they have ever appealed for their information to any original sources outside of Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic; and as to these, they pay no attention to the great Greek writers mentioned above. If they are so careless and unreliable where their assertions can be investigated, what ground have they for expecting us to rely upon them where their assertions cannot be tested? If the statements of the Biblical writers are found to be confirmed when they can be tested by outside evidence, is it not right to presume that they are correct when no evidence for, or against, their statements is within our knowledge?

Variations in Numbers Will Be Better Understood When Israel's Numerical Signs Are Discovered.

The other objections to the trustworthiness of the records of Chronicles are mostly purely subjective in character, utterly devoid of any objective evidence in their favor; or they are based upon interpretations which are impossible to prove. Are we driven to conclude, for example, that a thousand of thousands means exactly one million, neither more nor less? May it not mean many, or countless, thousands, just as a generation of generations means many generations? And are the critics who find the account that the Chronicler gives of the conspiracy against Athaliah inconsistent with that given in Kings quite sure that the captain and the guard of Kings cannot have

been priests and Levites? Besides, how can we expect to explain satisfactorily all apparent incongruities in documents that are thousands of years old?

As to the variations in numbers in the different sources, they are probably due to different readings of the original signs. But we do not know what signs the Hebrews used; and so we cannot at present discuss intelligently the reasons for the variations, and never shall until the system of numerical signs used by the Israelites has been discovered. And everybody knows how difficult it is to copy numerical signs correctly. There is nothing usually in the context to help us to determine just how many men were in an army, or how many were killed in a given battle. The important thing is, who won the fight.

I once inquired what was the population of a certain Southern city. One told me 40,000; another, 120,000. When I asked for an explanation of the discrepancy, I was told that there were 40,000 whites and 80,000 negroes. Both estimates were true; but had they been written down in two different documents, what charges of inconsistency might not have been made by future scientific historians!

The Chronicler Need Not Have Copied from Kings.

Again, in their criticism of Chronicles, the critics proceed on the presumption that, in the portions that are parallel to Kings, the author has merely copied from Kings, and that he has no further sources of reliable information. The author of Chronicles himself states that he had a number of such sources. Can the critics give any good reason to show that he did not have these sources? Why, since the Chronicles of the kings of Israel were not destroyed by Sargon when Samaria was overthrown, and Hosea, Amos, the so-called Jehovist and Elohistic parts of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy, and other works of the Hebrews were not destroyed at the time of the destruction

of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, should we suppose that the records of the kings of Israel and Judah were not in existence when the writers of Kings and Chronicles composed their works?

And why, since so many hundreds of works of the ancient Greeks, such as those mentioned by Pliny,[23] have since utterly disappeared, are we to suppose that the Jews of Ezra's time did not also possess many works that have long since been obliterated? The Aramaic recension of the Behistun Inscription of Darius Hystaspis and the Aramaic work of Ahikar were buried at Elephantine for twenty-three hundred years, but have now been unearthed and show that the Aramaic-speaking Jews of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. had produced *some* literary documents at least in addition to the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel.[24] How many more of such works may have been possessed by them both in Hebrew and Aramaic we cannot say, but the probability is that they were numerous. We cannot see that there is sufficient reason for doubting the claim of the Chronicler to have had access to sources extending from the time of David down to his own time. He says that he did have such sources. How can the critics know that he did not?

One of the most unjustifiable of the assults upon the Old Testament Scriptures lies in the assumption that the larger part of the great poetical and legal productions and some of the finest prophecies were produced during the period of her political and linguistic decay, which followed the year 500 B.C. The only time after the end of the captivity at which we might naturally have expected a recrudescence of such literary activity was the period from 200 B.C. to the time of Pompey. And here in fact are to be placed the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works of Ecclesiasticus,

---

[23] "Natural History," Book I. [24] See Sachau, "Papyrus."

Wisdom, First Maccabees, Jubilees, parts of Enoch, and many other works of greater or less value.[25]

The only one of these that has been preserved in Hebrew is Ecclesiasticus; and its Hebrew has no word that is certainly Greek, and not one of Persian origin that is not found in the Old Testament.[26]

Many traces of Persian influence are visible in Chronicles, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah.[27] When, however, we come to the Hebrew of the Psalms, of which so many are placed by the critics in this period, of Ecclesiastes, and of the Hebrew part of Daniel, we find that the language differs markedly from Ecclesiasticus both in vocabulary and forms.

The use of the conjunction "and" with the perfect, which is said to be a mark of the lateness of Ecclesiastes, is not found in Ecclesiasticus. Ecclesiastes is devoid of any words that are certainly Babylonian, Persian, or Aramaic. The so-called Maccabean Psalms have no Persian or Greek words and few if any that are certainly Babylonian; and only a few that are even alleged to have Aramaic vocables or forms.

The period between 500 and 164 B.C. was one in which the Israelites were subservient to the government of Persia and the Greeks. The only reliable information from this time about a revival of national feeling and semi-independence among the Jews is that to be found in Ezra-Nehemiah and a few hints in Ecclesiasticus and Tobit. And the only literary works in Hebrew that were certainly written during this period of decay are the books of Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. As we would expect, they are all characterized by Persian, Babylonian, and

---

[25]See "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament," by R. H. Charles.

[26]See Strack's and Smend's editions.

[27]See Driver, "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," *in loc.*

Aramaic words, and Ezra is nearly half composed in Aramaic.

Prophecies That Contain No Persian or Greek Word.

But how about Jonah, Joel, Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii., the Priest Codex, the Song of Songs, and the multitude of Psalms, which the critics arbitrarily place in this period? There is not in them one certainly Persian word, nor a single Greek word. Not a Babylonian word, not already found in the earlier literature, appears in any one of them, and scarcely a word that the critics even can allege to be an Aramaism. In language, style, and thought, no greater contrast can be found in the whole literature of the Old Testament than there is between the books that purport to have been written and those which the critics allege to have been written in this period.

It is to be hoped that the reader appreciates the value and the bearing of these facts. The Higher Criticism, as Dr. Driver affirms in the Preface to his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," is based upon "a comparative study of the writings." No one will object to this method of investigation. Only, let us *abide by the results*. Let us not bring in our subjective views and make them outweigh the obvious facts.

Nothing in 1800 Years of History to Invalidate the Old Testament.

Last of all, we must cast a glance at the history of the religion of Israel. It must be admitted that, before we can attempt such a history, we must determine two great facts: first, the dates of the documents on which the history is based; and, secondly, the attitude we are going to take with regard to miracle and prophecy. As to the first of these facts, I have already given a number of the reasons for holding that there is no sufficient ground for believing that

the Pentateuch did not originate with Moses, or that David did not write many of the Psalms; and that there is every reason in language and history for supposing that all but a few of the books were written before 500 B.C. I have not attempted to fix the exact dates of composition, or final redaction, of the books composed before that time, preferring rather to show that there is nothing in the history of the world from 2000 to 164 B.C. that militates against the possibility, nor even against the probability, of the trustworthiness of the history of Israel as recorded in the Old Testament. Nor, in spite of some apparent inconsistencies and of many passages difficult to explain satisfactorily, owing to our ignorance of all the facts, is there anything in the history of Israel as recorded in the Old Testament that makes it appear incredible or unveracious. No one knows enough to affirm with confidence that any one of the prophetic books was not written by the man whose name it bears. No one knows enough to assert that the kings and others mentioned did not do and say what is ascribed to them.

If, then, we can accept the documents of the Old Testament as substantially correct, we come to the further question of whether the presentment of the Israelitish religion, as we find it described in the Old Testament, is true. But there is no use of discussing this subject until at least the possibility of God's making known his will to man is admitted. Whoever admits this possibility is in a fair way to become a Christian. So long as one denies this, he cannot possibly become a Christian nor even a Theist. For those who believe in the resurrection of Jesus and what it implies as to the person and work of the Son of God and of his apostles under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the question of the history of the religion of Israel assumes an entirely different character and purpose. It becomes part of the plan of God for the world's redemption. They who accept the statements of the New Testament writers and of

the Lord as true will accept what they say about the Old Testament as true until it is proved to be false. And when the Old Testament is shown not to agree with what Christ and the apostles say, it will be presumed that the text has not been rightly transmitted or correctly interpreted.

The Plan, Purpose, and People of the History of Redemption Offer a Reasonable Basis for Belief.

The attitude of one who believes that God spake to man through the prophets to whom he gave a message for his people is also fundamentally different from that of one who disbelieves this hundred-times repeated statement of the Old Testament. A *believer* in *Theism* can accept the statements of the Old Testament books, especially in the light of the New, as being what they appear on the face of them to be. If any statements of the Old Testament are proved to be false, he lays the blame to a corruption of the text or to a wrong interpretation of the evidence. For he is convinced that the Bible contains the revelation of the divine plan for the redemption of humanity from sin unto holiness and everlasting life. All that he wants, or needs, to have established, is that this plan has been handed down to us in a sufficiently reliable form to insure the purpose of the divine author. The reasonable Christian can rejoice and believe that the Bible has thus been handed down. The plan is there in the documents of the Old Testament and of the New, as clear as day. The purpose is there. The Jewish people existed and exists, according to the Scripture, as an ever-present evidence that the plan and the purpose were of God.

The Christian Church in like manner exists as an evidence that the Gospel of salvation was really meant for the whole world. This Gospel has met and satisfied the need and the hope of human nature for pardon and communion with God, and it is meeting them to-day. Millions exult in their present faith and die at peace and in hope of a

blessed and an everlasting life. The Bible and the church are the foundation of this faith and peace and hope. The history of Israel is continued in the history of the Christian Church. He who attacks one attacks both. United they stand; divided they fall. Unitedly they present a reasonable foundation for the belief that God has never left himself without a witness that he loves mankind and will have all men to believe and to come to a knowledge of the truth. Looked at in the light of the whole world's history from the beginning until now, the history of the religion of the Old Testament as given in the books themselves, unrevised and fairly interpreted, is rational and worthy of trust. In this faith we live; in this faith let us die.

A Parallel Monstrosity to the Denial of Old Testament History Imagined.

Notwithstanding this evident plan and purpose of a divine redemption which runs all through the Scriptures, there are to-day many professedly Christian writers who treat of the Israelitish religion as if it were a purely natural development. They diligently pick out every instance of a superstitious observance, or of a departure from the law, or of a disobedience to the divine commands, as if these represented the true religion of ancient Israel. They cut up the books and doctor the documents and change the text and wrest the meaning, to suit the perverted view of their own fancy. They seem to think that they know better what the Scriptures ought to have been than the prophets and apostles and even the Lord himself! They tell us when revelations must have been made, and how and where they must have been given, and what their contents could have been, as if they knew more about such matters than God himself. Imagine a man's writing the history of the last eighteen hundred years and denying that the New Testament had been in existence during all that time, denying that the Christian Church with all its

saving doctrines and benevolent institutions and beneficent social system derived from the New Testament had been active and, in a sense, triumphant for at least fifteen hundred years, simply because he could select thousands of examples of superstitious customs, and hellish deeds, and impious words, and avowed agnostics, and heaven-defying atheists, that have disgraced the pages of history during this time!

Grovel for Beetles—or Pluck Violets?

Let us not grovel for the beetles and the earthworms of almost forgotten faiths which may perchance be discovered beneath the stones and sod of the Old Testament, while the violets and the lilies-of-the-valley of a sweet and lowly faith are in bloom on every page and every oracle revealed within the Word of God is jubilant with songs of everlasting joy. The true religion of Israel came down from God arrayed in the beautiful garments of righteousness and life. We cannot substitute for this heaven-made apparel a robe of human manufacture, however fine it be.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 5

The Integrity of the Old Testament

By

HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1925

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 4.—"Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" Clearly Attested Facts Showing That the Destructive "Assured Results of Modern Scholarship" Are Indefensible. By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Semitic Philology in Princeton Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 5.—"The Integrity of the Old Testament," by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law (London); Author of "The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism," "The Origin of the Pentateuch," "Pentateuchal Studies," "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," "Studies in Biblical Law," etc. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 6.—"Archæology Vs. Wellhausenism; or, In What Respect Have the Foundations of the Religio-Historical System of Wellhausen Been Proven Unstable by Modern Researches in the Ancient Orient?" By Professor Ernest Sellin (Berlin). With an Introduction by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER FIVE.

The Integrity of the Old Testament.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW (LONDON).

With Introduction by the Editor.

V.

INTRODUCTION.

THE author of the following essay on "The Integrity of the Old Testament" is a Hebrew of the Hebrews. Learned and skilled in the knowledge of the ancient language of his people, he has used that knowledge in the defense of the revelation made to Moses and the prophets in a way that has given him international distinction both amongst Jews and Christians. Thoroughly possessed of the conviction that Jew and Christian must stand together in promoting the war against destructive criticism, Mr. Wiener has been welcomed into the great Christian publications of Europe and America, and is counted in both the Old and the New World as one of the pillars of the conservative school of Old Testament science. An alumnus of Cambridge University, recognized by the British Government as an authority on ancient law, and having an easy mastery especially of German literature and philosophy, he is particularly advantaged in the contest which now so certainly promises to be decisive against the destructive criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures.

In the present essay, which Mr. Wiener has specially prepared for the "Aftermath Series," he has placed his batteries at the undoubted focal of the issue. The integrity of the Old Testament—the question of its inherent uprightness, or predicable sincerity—is the issue upon which it is to abide forever or pass to a final oblivion. If it can be established, as the critics seek to do, that the Old Testament is an afterthought patchwork from the output of nondescript looms of legend, folklore, and tendential literature, then it can maintain no permanent

challenge for the human mind and must finally be superseded by some such "*bibel*" as the "German holy writing" referred to by Mr. Wiener in his essay.

The asseveration of Mr. Wiener concerning a "Pan-German" cult whose purpose was the overthrow of the special authority of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures is well justified by fact and history. Not all Germans are culpable in this regard, as not all Americans are Mammon worshipers, and not all Englishmen are land grabbers. But there has been in Germany, for a century past, a scholastic integration which has sought the overthrow of the Scriptures as the preëminent word of God. This has been done through various ways and by the application of various means. We may cite here the strictures of Dr. Kegel on the output of the school of Delitzsch, whose anti-Semitism and rationalism led him to attack both the Talmud and the Bible.

We are looking to German scholarship and faith, more than to any or all other human agencies, to restore traditional reverence for the Old Testament. But our loyal allies in Germany now freely allow that the thought of their country has, for the past century, led the whole world of theology astray. It has come to be now well-nigh a general confession, and pitiable to the last degree, that the world of theology supinely submitted to this Teutonic domination. Let Teutonic thought and faith now give us a better mastery, and one that we can follow, not supinely, but with the strength of an open vision.

Strongly and effectively, as it will be found, our author projects his argument from this ultimate: Can it be shown that the Old Testament is what it claims to be—a writing extending through the ages from Moses to the last of the Minor Prophets? Moreover, is dependence to be placed in the several and collective claims, both direct

and logically inferential, which, as to form and verity, must determine this integrity? The answer to this is not a labored disquisition, but, as space requires, the presentation and treatment of a series of instances in point, and particularly of instances which the destructivists have used in their most determined assaults.

As an "aftermath" of the long-drawn critical contest in this country and Europe, I direct attention to a fact noticed by Mr. Wiener, a fact upon which I have been laying stress for a dozen years past—namely, that critical schools, groups, and individuals in Great Britain and America have accepted the conclusions of the German arch critics on a basis of practically no subjective evidence. Mr. Wiener shows that during the last fifty to seventy years, the period of intensity in the waging of this controversy, almost no book (perhaps two or three) of pronounced philological or radically determinative character has been contributed by an English-writing author to the science of Bible criticism. It has been a servile dependence upon Teutonic mastership. I will leave the reader to decide if I have written hastily in another connection in this series when I affirmed that the higher critical contingent amongst us here in America is entitled to a clement judgment on the score of intellectual *innocence.*

If I needed support in this position, I should have only to refer the reader to Dr. Wilson's very scholarly and convincing booklet, the immedate predecessor of this number of the "Aftermath Series." This is a phase of the critical controversy which has been overlooked. The full exhibition of it is the eventuality upon which the whole destructive hypothesis is to be visited with certain defeat. No deadlier question has been asked during the whole history of this controversy than the one asked by Dr. Wilson: "Is the higher criticism scholarly?"

The point made by Mr. Wiener that the authors of the Old Testament delivered their messages in good faith

expresses an absolute value, a value which matches up with the primordial that the Old Testament came from the righteous God. With these as correlates, the higher critical construction of Israelitish history is ruled out. On that construction there is no room for a revelation, or even a consciously developed religio-ethical system. Under such an order a divine purpose is as improbable as is a reciprocal human consciousness. The Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis makes the God of the Old Testament a master of Olympian deception and the authors of the codes and the prophecies the pliant tools of an age-long fraud.

The temperamental impossibility of a so long sustained misdirection, through so many minds, should have occurred long ago to the pragmatists and their disciples; but delusion and stupefaction have done their work on the one and the other. In the absence of apprehension on the part of the opposition, the true criticism of the Scriptures now drives home the truth that what in the way of double dealing was impossible to men was infinitely removed from the ways of the divine.

It brings equally to the place of strength in this argument that the men who may have served in the capacity of editors of the ancient matter of the books of the law and the prophets acted also in good faith. It lies on the face of their task and its output that they believed unfeignedly in the claims to antiquity made for the codes which they handled and the prophecies which they fitted into the canon. There is neither earthly nor heavenly reason for questioning their sincerity. That sincerity established, the higher criticism becomes a lawless marauder on the preserves of honest men.

The contentions of the critics would give little less than five hundred years to Scripture ordering and redaction; and yet during all that half millennium, or thereabouts, not one word, not one syllable, escaped the pen of any one of these that he was being made party to a deception, or

that he acted in the interest of a tendency or a cabal. It is the quality of such insincerity and partisanship that, sooner or later, it betrays itself. But the lips of this testimony are as stout at the end as at the beginning. Faith in Moses and the law as inseparable was as great in the creed of Stephen and Peter as in that of Isaiah and the Chronicler. And Isaiah and the other prophets are quoted by Christ and his apostles in absolute testimony to the integrity of their claims as to authorship and prescience.

An oftentimes pitiable aspect of the scholastic adhesion of the past fifty years has been seen in the cases of men who, while accepting the most radical conclusions of the higher criticism, have yet sought to hold on to faith in the integrity of the Scriptures. This suggests the persistence of convictions acquired under normal conditions of faith and reason; but, on the other hand, it suggests the workings of a fallacy that misses the grounds of both reason and faith. The attitude of Delitzsch, who stands at the end of the higher critical succession, and the logic of "The Great Deception," represent the finality of the hypothesis. If the history course of the Old Testament be what the critics affirm, and so long have labored to prove, then it is not a question of method in presentation or of tendency in writing, but rather it is one of outraged ethics. It is a comedy farce on the stage of eternity.

While it is well never to give too severe a tone even to the language of reprobation, the time has come in the history of that pragmatism which has dealt so unallowably with the Old Testament history when it must be judged to the limit of its deserts. Legitimate criticism has rendered the Scriptures an invaluable and lasting service; but the usurpers of the office of criticism have dealt in treason and lawless privileges.

Attention is directed to the observation of Mr. Wiener that, though there are particular precepts in the codes of

the Old Testament which are paralleled in the laws and morals of other ancient peoples, no such *body* of laws is found elsewhere, nor anything which in any manner approaches thereto. The code of Hammurabi is not to be listed against it, for, while undoubtedly Moses knew the Babylonian code or its original, and profited from this knowledge, the code of Israel so far transcends it that the relation of the two can only be thought of as incidental.

Mr. Wiener further points out that the large element in the Israelitish code is, after all, not *legal*, but *theological*. It is in this element that it transcends and that its laws go so far above and beyond their nearest type, the code of Hammurabi. That the proof of direct revelation, or direct divine operation, is to be reasoned from this superiority goes without argument. A body of laws supporting such a theology could not have been a slow development. That would have been to imagine an idea without its articulate words. The revealed theology of Israel was clothed with revealed words in the form of answering laws. A parallel to the theocracy of Israel in any kind of suggestive degree is not traceable in the history of any ancient people, even those most favorably situated, as, for instance, the Babylonians and the Greeks. It is the measure of the divine character in the Hebrew writings and not the form or touch of particular statutes that proclaims the whole as a revelation. It is Jehovah—the I AM—who could not become known to men through their unaided intellects, who gives to the Old Testament its meaning and makes it different from all other ancient literatures.

Yet a single other suggestion of Mr. Wiener's (where so many others might be mentioned) must prove of great value to the serious-minded student of Old Testament criticism. The critics have made much of the sometimes obviously disjointed relations of the different parts of the Mosaic code, arguing therefrom the theory of "sources" and "fragments." Mr. Wiener (and few, if any, can speak

with more authority) thinks this is due to the laws and records of the Mosaic age having been written on "skins" of small dimensions, at different times, and then later mechanically joined together. Whatever lack of literal harmony must be supposed to result from this process, there is little room for doubt that the writers of the Mosaic age were shut up to the necessity of using fragmentary materials for their compositions. It was the logic of their times. The reader will also be interested to note how this section-writing, with the cultic consciousness of later copyists, may have operated to create "the divine name groupings" upon which adverse criticism has so much theorized. "An Israelite indeed" sits to instruct us. With Christian cordiality we will ponder his words.

CONTENTS.

I. General 195

Preliminary.—Integrity here not used in sense of wholeness nor to deny that the Old Testament has passed through textual vicissitudes, but in sense of uprightness.—The rationalist opposition to the Old Testament.—The Pan-German development.—Causes of its predominance.—An instance of its methods from Stade's treatment of Hosea.—Culmination in the Wellhausen theory.—Attitude of the moderate critics.—Opposition of conservative scholarship and its growing success.—Formulation of the contentions as to the integrity of the Old Testament.—Witness of contents of Old Testament to the presence of a Divine element.—This shown from the legal element.—General observations on the critical problems.—Ezekiel's oracle against Tyre.—Hebrew use of certain numbers.—Difficulties due to state of the text.—Early form of Hebrew book.—Resulting difficulties.—Passages relating to the judicial practice and the tent of meeting.—Rearrangement of certain passages of Numbers.—Dislocations in the prophets.

II. The Pentateuch 214

Emendation of texts on the authority of Biblical passages.—Consequent difficulties.—The legal arguments of the critics due to lack of proper legal equipment.—The sacrificial law.—Wellhausen's confusion as to sanctuaries.

III. The Prophets 219

Integrity a question of inspiration, not of authorship.—Isaiah on Zidon.—The reunion of Israel and Judah in circa 625 B.C.—Hosea's predictions.—The reunion after the exile.—Jeremiah's prediction.—Isaiah xi. 11–16.—Conventions of prophecy.—The conditional principle.—The time element.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I. General.

At the beginning of an essay of this character it is natural to ask two questions: What is meant by the integrity of the Old Testament? and, Why is it necessary to write about it? These two questions are best answered by a short outline of the issues involved and the contentions of the opposing sides. This will have the additional advantage of giving us an easy approach to the main problems under discussion.

The constitution of the Old Testament is too well known to need definition here; but when we speak of its integrity in what sense do we use the phrase? "Integrity" is a word of several meanings and it is necessary to clear our minds by ascertaining which of these it is that we desire to convey when we use the phrase. Integrity often conveys the notion of wholeness, but it is not with that signification that we use it here. We do not mean that the Old Testament contains the whole of the Hebrew literature of the period over which it extends, for we have in it many references to books that are no longer extant. For instance, in the books of Kings we often find appeals to the books of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and Judah. These are not in our possession. Nor does the phrase mean that we have in the Old Testament the whole of the utterances that were believed to be inspired by God during the centuries of which it treats, for we have references to inspired utterances that are not in our possession. Ezekiel, for instance, tells us that God spoke in the old time of Gog by his servants the prophets of Israel, but their messages about him have not come down to us.

Nor again is the phrase intended to suggest that the Hebrew Bible has been exempted from the ordinary vicissitudes of manuscript tradition. It is well known that the ancient Versions often present a text that differs from the Hebrew. It is quite possible to adopt other readings in preference to the received text in certain places without questioning the integrity of the Old Testament. For example, in Genesis iv. 8 we read, "And Cain said to Abel his brother," but what he said is not reported in the Hebrew. Several ancient authorities, however, add the words, "Let us go to the field." It is perfectly possible to adopt this reading without questioning the integrity of the Old Testament.

Moreover, there may be textual troubles that originated before the Versions were made and consequently cannot be corrected merely with their aid. Yet the integrity of a book is not inconsistent with a recognition of the fact that where it has been handed down for many centuries by manuscript copying its text may have been affected in the same ways as those of all other books that have a similar history behind them. It is rather in the sense of uprightness that we use the expression here, and we cannot do better than to begin by examining the reasons that have led to the questioning of that uprightness.

There has never been an age in which men have not been found who did not believe in the existence of a God who rules the world. To them the Old Testament with its record of supernatural intervention in the affairs of men necessarily offers a stumblingblock. Hence the rationalists are compelled by the character of their thought to seek to discredit its testimony. Conversely of course, if that testimony stands, rationalism is discredited. But rationalism has found strange allies in unexpected places. There is a school of thought in Germany known as the Pan-German which represents a certain tendency of

the German soul.[1] I say expressly "a certain tendency," for it would be as unjust as it would be foolish to suggest that all Germans are the victims of this peculiar development. But its existence is indubitable, and it must be taken into account.

Now Pan-Germanism aims at becoming the predominating spiritual power in the world. If it is to succeed, it must first destroy the belief that any other people received a revelation. The results of a lost war may be reversed by a future war; but as long as it is believed that another people received communications and a mission from God himself, Pan-Germanism can never win spiritual supremacy. And so for centuries the German soul has yearned to overcome the obstacle. Some sentences may be quoted from a book which bears the significant title, "*Germanen-Bibel, Aus heiligen Schriften Germanischer Völker herausgegeben von Wilhelm Schwaner*" (Bible of the Germans, edited from Holy Writings of Germanic peoples by Wilhelm Schwaner; fifth edition, 1920). In the preface to the first edition, which is dated 1904, we find the following:

> It is the first attempt to show the Germans in a single book what treasures were left by their prophets. If those who are better qualified proceed hereafter to the perfection of the Bible of the Germans, and if they bring with them as much love for the German character as has inspired me, the first collector, that for which the best minds of the last centuries have yearned cannot fail to come into existence—viz., the counterpart of the Bible of the Jews and Christians, equal to it in value (*dann muss werden was die besten der letzten Jahrhunderte ersehnt: das gleichwertige Gegenstück der Juden- und Christenbibel*). And from the Vedas, the cuneiform laws, the Bibles of Jews, Christians, Germans, Latins, and Slavs future generations can create that which will some day unite all men and make them happy, the Bible of humanity.

---

[1] Much of this and some of the succeeding paragraphs are based on a letter sent by the writer to the *Jewish Chronicle* for December 23, 1921.

The mentality which this program reveals is definitely anti-Jewish and anti-Christian. It can see in a Bible no element of revelation, nothing which an intelligent race cannot produce without Higher aid. This mentality is not something new, but has characterized German minds—not, of course, all German minds—for centuries. While many Germans would repudiate such views, they are held by a great section of the Pan-Germans—*i. e.*, of the Germans who dream of universal domination for their race. The bible of humanity need not be taken seriously, for once the sanctity of the *Germanenbibel* was established, the Germans would certainly not desire any bibles of Latins or Slavs.

This program necessitates the destruction of the belief in a revelation. And, accordingly, the utmost efforts of the German universities have been put forward to discredit the Bible, partly, perhaps unconsciously, but always tending to the same end. At first they met with great opposition in Germany itself. There were plenty of Christian theologians who adhered to the old views. But gradually the destructive preachings prevailed, until at last there was no university in Germany where their dominance was not complete. Minor differences there were. Some professors were a little more positive—*i. e.*, conservative; others, on the other hand, more radical. But in general the distinctions were of the kind that differentiate tweedledum from tweedledee.

What were the other nations doing? For the most part, nothing. These unspiritual labors made little appeal to religious minds. While the German theologians worked, the rest of the world (with the possible exception of Holland) looked on or slumbered. Consequently the Germans had it all their own way. Their "*Wissenschaft*," for what it was worth, was the only modern study of the Old Testament in existence.

Thus it came about that the Dutch theologians who

strove to grapple with biblical problems found little but German thought to guide them. Not unnaturally they went with the stream. The most prominent of them was Abraham Kuenen, the celebrated Dutch rationalist, who was professor in Leyden from 1852 to 1891. A man of great ability and learning, marked however by the usual defects of philological and theological professors, he exercised profound influence on thought throughout the Christian world. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to attach too much importance to him and the other members of the Dutch school. Without their work the positions of the Germans would not have been substantially different, but it is difficult to say what Kuenen would have been without the work of the Germans.

The part played by the English in this discussion may be shown by the attitude taken by the late Professor Driver, the recognized leader of the English school. In the preface to the first edition of his Treatise on the "Use of the Tenses in Hebrew," the following passage occurs: "To English books (except Dr. Kalisch's "Hebrew Grammar and Professor Wright's "Arabic Grammar," which are indispensable to every student), I am under no obligation whatever: I could wish that the case had been otherwise, but, at least in questions of scholarship, the majority of English writers upon the Old Testament seem to me to be incapable of offering an opinion of any value which has not been derived from some foreign source."

That was written in 1874. The British universities and seminaries had at that time produced only one book of any value in the Semitic field, and that was not on the Old Testament, but on Arabic. Nor have matters improved since. Professor F. M. Th. Böhl's "*Het Oude Testament*," published in 1919, contains biographical notes not merely of the great scholars of the past, but also of the most notable living writers on the Old Testament. Great Britain is, I think, represented by only five names.

Four of these are provided by the universities and theological colleges. To the world, these four men stand out simply as representatives of the dominant German views who "are incapable of offering any opinion of any value which has not been derived from some foreign source," though, to my knowledge, one of them has changed his mind since issuing the publication to which he owes his place in this volume, and now holds that the pillars of the German edifice have been shaken. And so it has been throughout. "It is sufficient," wrote the late Professor Robertson Smith, in the preface of his "Religion of the Semites" (1889), "to name Kuenen and Wellhausen as the men whose acumen and research have carried this inquiry to a point where nothing of vital importance for the historical study of the Old Testament religion still remains uncertain."

It is not strange that Old Testament studies as at present generally followed possess little attraction for the English genius and draw no ability of the first rank in British universities. It would be difficult to imagine a more barren or unprofitable field. But the consequence of the abstention of the best minds of other nations is that the study of the Old Testament which arrogates to itself the title "modern" is merely the intellectual product of Pan-Germanism, aided by a few Dutch rationalists. That good ability should stand aloof is comprehensible, but, in the long run, it will have proved a misfortune; for it has converted the Old Testament studies of our time into a powerful engine of German propaganda. This should be clearly grasped, for at bottom the attack on our faith is due to the influence of Pan-Germanism.

It may be desirable to give a short example of the way in which its results are obtained. I select one that an intelligent schoolboy could grasp. One Bernhard Stade, who was professor in Giessen from 1875 to 1906, wrote a ponderous history of Israel. He found in Hosea viii. 4

the words, "They have set up kings, but not by me," used in connection with Israel. He was entirely ignorant of the fact that this prophet naturally and correctly makes a practice of using the word Israel of the Northern kingdom of the ten tribes which had resulted from Jeroboam's schism and employs it here in that sense. As a result, Stade understood the verse to be a condemnation of the kingdom of united Israel, the monarchy of Saul and David. Full of this idea, he applied the references to Gibeah in Hosea ix. 9 and x. 9 to the kingdom of Saul instead of to the episode narrated in Judges.

After these remarkable feats of exegesis Stade found that Hosea iii. 5 was in conflict with his theory. The prophet foretells that the children of Israel—*i. e.*, of the Northern kingdom—would return and seek the Lord their God "and David their king." How could he do that if he regarded the monarchy of all Israel with disfavor? To anybody of ordinary intelligence the passage is merely an additional proof that Stade had no conception of Hosea's meaning. But that was not the view of the professor. Did the words conflict with his theory? Well, then, they could not be genuine. They must be struck out and attributed to a later interpolator.

That one professor should act in this way, though discreditable, is at any rate intelligible. But his fellow professors regarded him as a man of light and leading, and they were mostly just as ignorant as he was of the meaning of Israel in Hosea. Consequently they copied his views into their books, and it became a commonplace of "modern criticism" that the words "and David their king" were an interpolation in Hosea's text. Anybody who did not agree would be dismissed from consideration as unworthy of attention.

Thus, far well over a century, every word of the Bible has been subjected to criticism that was always ignorant, prejudiced, unintelligent, and unspiritual, and frequently

malignant. Everything that conflicted with any German theory, however wild and baseless, was declared to be the work of an interpolator or editor or literary forger. This culminated in what is known as the Wellhausen theory, of which more hereafter.

Some of Wellhausen's followers endeavored to evade the logical consequences of their views, but the leader himself had no responsibility for that. He is commonly reported to have delivered himself in these terms: "I knew the Old Testament was a fraud, but I never dreamt, as these Scottish fellows do, of making God a party to the fraud."

The rationalists were delighted. Huxley did all he could to spread the new views in well-known essays. In his correspondence he expresses his real opinion, which was no less sound than incisive. "If Satan had wished to devise the best means of discrediting revelation, he could not have done better." The Pan-Germans knew their business.

Some who were less thoroughgoing endeavored to reconcile the views of the Wellhausen School with a belief in God by talking vaguely of progressive revelation. This overlooked the fact that while the knowledge of mankind is progressive in character that of the All-wise is not. It is impossible to suggest that God did not know the difference between straightforwardness and fraud twenty-five centuries ago, but has learned it since, and the net result of the proceeding was merely to expose the moderate critics to the full force of Wellhausen's bitter jibes.

Conservative scholarship has never ceased to campaign against these views, and its efforts are at last bearing fruit. *The higher criticism is retreating all along the line.*

Three instances may be quoted from three different countries.

Professor James A. Montgomery writes as follows in the *Journal of Religion* for November, 1922 (Vol. II.,

1422

No. 6), pages 643-644: "In a word, we are reminded that, while philology may be a science, literary criticism is not, that the possible combinations are too manifold and the subjective element in the critic too uncontrollable to allow finality. The very elements of textual and of metrical criticism which have been vaunted by some scholars as scientific tests can be used by other hands to opposite ends. Our judgment on gunpowder or poison gas varies, depending upon whether our enemies use them or we have learned their use." This is the exact opposite of their former claim that their criticism was a well-established science.

Dr. S. A. Cook, formerly a most advanced critic, was constrained to admit in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July, 1920 (Vol. XXI., No. 84), page 378, that "there is an *impasse* in biblical criticism." Most important of all, Professor Löhr of Königsberg has publicly abandoned the documentary and Wellhausen theories (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1921, col. 124).

The two main battle grounds are provided by the Pentateuch and the Prophets, respectively, and accordingly separate divisions of this essay will be devoted to these two heads; but there is much of a general nature that may be said here.

In contrast to the views we have surveyed our contentions as to the integrity of the Old Testament may be formulated as follows:

1. The Old Testament contains a divine element which is different in kind as well as in degree from any that may be held to be present in purely secular literature;

2. That divine element emanates from a righteous God;

3. The human authors delivered their messages in good faith;

4. The men who are responsible for the composition and present form of the Old Testament acted in good faith.

It is particularly in the postulate of good faith that

this view differs from that of the so-called "moderate critics," who are never tired of imputing fraud to everybody, though they frequently prefer to avoid the actual word and wrap up their meaning in nebulous language. In opposition to the thoroughgoing rationalists our view also emphasizes the presence of a divine element emanating from a righteous God.

This divine element is attested by the nature of the contents of the Old Testament; the nature of the law, the nature of the history, the nature of the prophecies, the nature of the religion. It is not suggested that God created a people that differed fundamentally from others, but rather that he took a people like unto others and stamped on the ordinary things of its life something entirely distinctive.

There is a stage in human development where life is generally seen whole, and it is to this stage that the Pentateuch belongs.[2] But no other legislation so takes up one department of man's life after another and impresses on them all the relationship of God and people. Perhaps nothing will so clearly bring out my meaning as a statement of some of the more fundamental differences between the Pentateuchal legislation and the old Indian law books which often provide excellent parallels to it. Those to which I desire to draw particular attention are as follows: The Indian law books have no idea of national (as distinct from individual) righteousness—a conception that entered the world with the Mosaic legislation and has perhaps not made very much progress there since. There is (in the Indian law books) no personal God: hence his personal interest in righteousness is lacking; hence, too, there can be no relationship between God and people; and while there is a supernatural element in the contemplated results of human actions, there is noth-

[2]This paragraph is taken from the author's Pentateuchal studies.

ing that can in the slightest degree compare with the Personal Divine intervention which is so often proposed in the Pentateuchal laws.[3]

The Hindu caste system, like Hammurabi's class system, leads to distinctions that are always inequitable. The conception of loving one's neighbor and one's sojourner as one's self are alike lacking. The systematic provisions for poor relief are absent, and the legislation is generally on a lower ethical and moral level; while some of the penalties are distinguished by the most perverted and barbarous cruelty. All these points are embraced in the special relationship of the One God and the peculiar treasure, with its resulting need for national and individual holiness.

"There exist numberless parallels to almost every institution and idea contained in the law. Talion and blood-feud, sin and crime, clean and unclean, the priestly order, sacrifice and ritual, all may be paralleled from other races. Nor is it different if we turn to individual rules. With certain striking exceptions (*e. g.*, the law as to strangers) it is possible to parallel most of the laws, even such a detail as the permission to pluck grapes, etc., Deuteronomy xxiii. 24 f. [25 f.]; cf. Post, *Grundriss*, ii. 426; Manu, viii. 341 (with characteristic differences), etc.

"Nor again is this the only legislation that claims a divine origin, or that seeks to regulate extrajural matters. The Hindu law books, for example, deal with faith, penances, purifications, dress, demeanor, etc., as well as jural law. Every ancient legislation is and must be the creation of its age; and as the objects of legislators are everywhere similar, and laws are everywhere directed to molding human conduct, it follows that every archaic

---

[3] "And if ye shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? behold, we shall not sow, nor gather in our increase: then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for the three years." (Lev. xxv. 20 f.)

legislation belongs to a family group, and differs from other systems belonging to a similar stage of development only within certain more or less defined limits.

"Naturally, the law of Moses bears the impress of the history, the mind, and the character of the nation for which it was designed; but so does every other known system. And withal it is unique. (1) No other legislation is comparable in *literary form and beauty*. (2) While many of the rules can be paralleled, there is no parallel to such a *collection of humane rules:* hence the *spirit* and *general effect* of the whole are different from those of all other legislations. (3) Perhaps no similar legislation has ever been so *free from rules designed to benefit some privileged person or caste*. Special consideration is shown only to the helpless. But the true *differentia* is in none of these things, though it embraces and accounts for all. It lies in *the attitude toward the divine*. Everywhere the peculiar relation between the One God and the separated people—with all it involved in duty to God and duty to man—is stamped on institutions designed for a race that in its general ideas and primitive civilization differed very little from many other races in similar stages of development. This law centers in and leads to God. Its ultimate problem is not legal or literary or economic or social: it is theological."[4]

So much for the law. Of the uniqueness of the history and the religion it is surely unnecessary to speak to the public for which this booklet is primarily intended. The uniqueness of the prophecies will appear hereafter.

We must now turn to the matters which have been used to discredit the Old Testament.

Certain general observations may be made at once on the whole group of problems. In dealing with the Old Testament we are face to face with a literature that comes

[4]Murray's "Illustrated Bible Dictionary" (1908), page 466.

from a form of civilization that differs profoundly from ours in numerous ways. Hence before we can grasp its meaning we must master not merely its language but also its methods of expression and familiarize ourselves with the atmosphere in which it originated and the historical, geographical, political, intellectual, economic, social, and general cultural conditions which form its background. That is of course impossible in its entirety; yet much may be done by means of careful study. A few concrete instances may be useful as showing the effect of this.

In Isaiah xxxv. 2 we read of a desert that it shall "rejoice even with joy and singing." That is a figure of speech. A desert is not a rival of a *prima donna* and it is probable that even to-day few readers would regard this as more than a poetic expression signifying that the period will be one of great national joy. But in this case the nature of the figure puts the modern reader on his guard, and it is only for this reason that the figure of speech does not lead to serious misunderstanding in our prosaic age.

To go a step further, we may take an instance of a figurative expression which is misunderstood by prosaic commentators, but without any serious harm resulting. In Job xix. 20, we read the phrase "skin of the teeth." Editors have been found who are so completely divorced from all poetical feeling as to explain this as meaning the gums. In such a case, however, no particular injury results, for no far-reaching conclusions as to the character of the Old Testament are drawn by the critics from their own lack of poetic understanding in this instance. It is otherwise in the case we may now consider.

Ezekiel in delivering an oracle against Tyre uses the phrase "in the midst of the seas." Now it happens that there are two cities of the name of Tyre known to history. One was on an island site, the other on the mainland.

It is therefore inevitable that anybody who approaches Ezekiel imbued with the spirit of modern Western prose should assume that the prophet is speaking of the island city. Wider knowledge, however, shows that this is not necessarily the case. We have an inscription of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon in which this very expression is applied to Sidon, which was a purely mainland town. Thus it becomes clear that the phraseological exuberance of the ancient East used it simply to denote a seaport. Hence the inference which we should have felt justified in drawing from Ezekiel's language, if we had read his oracle without further knowledge, is unjustified. We cannot say that he is necessarily referring to an island, for the current usage of his age applied the phrase to continental ports, so that mainland Tyre may be intended. As a matter of fact we are not left in doubt, for the prophet predicts occurrences which could only happen on the mainland.

"For thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will bring upon Tyre Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and a company, and much people. He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the field: and he shall make forts against thee, and cast up a mount against thee, and raise up the buckler against thee. And he shall set his battering engines against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers. By reason of the abundance of his horses their dust shall cover thee: thy walls shall shake at the noise of the horsemen, and of the wagons, and of the chariots, when he shall enter into thy gates, as men enter into a city wherein is made a breach. With the hoofs of his horses shall he tread down all thy streets: he shall slay thy people with the sword, and the pillars of thy strength shall go down to the ground." (Ezekiel xxvi. 7-11.)

Now neither Ezekiel nor any of his contemporaries who

knew the elementary facts of Tyrian topography can for a moment have thought that the operations here foretold could have been performed on an island. The whole of the representation refers to a land army and such methods of siege and capture as are impossible in the case of an island. Hence there can be no doubt that it is of mainland Tyre that the prophet is speaking, and as a matter of fact his prediction was strikingly fulfilled. This may seem a small and unimportant point, but it is of great consequence.

In this oracle Ezekiel foretells that Tyre will fall to Nebuchadrezzar and never be rebuilt as a town. All this has been fulfilled of mainland Tyre, but not of island Tyre. For anybody who reads this with the necessary insight into contemporary methods of expression history has provided a most convincing proof of the prophet's supernatural inspiration, for without Divine aid nobody could have foretold the fate of an important existing city and been justified by the events of the next twenty-five centuries. Emphasis should be laid on this matter, for critics who have worked at the prophets without the necessary knowledge have always cited Ezekiel's prophecy against Tyre as an instance of a prediction that had been signally falsified by events. We now know that on the contrary it brilliantly sustains the case for supernaturalism.

The foregoing instance illustrates more than one of the pitfalls that beset the inquirer. We see difficulty created not merely by the methods of expression, but also by the geographical and historical background.

A further example in which methods of expression and intellectual conditions combine to create difficulties is provided by the use of some numbers. It has long been a subject of remark that the expression "forty" is not always to be taken as a fixed arithmetical number, but simply as an indefinite phrase like "many," "several," and

the same sometimes applies to some other numbers like seventy.[5] Such vagueness is found even in modern Western languages to some extent, as witness some of the uses of words like "dozen," "score"; but here it does no harm because we all know what is meant. It is otherwise with the Hebrew Scriptures, where commentators often distinguish themselves by taking literally expressions that any ancient Hebrew would have known to bear another signification. Hence arguments directed against the Bible that are based on such foundations may always be rejected as misconceived.

A very large proportion of the difficulties that have to be faced are due to the state of the text. Now the science of textual criticism should deal with this, but it has been very insufficiently practiced by the Old Testament students of the past. We may glance at a few of the many ways in which it can operate to help us.

In late Old Testament times the only form of book known was the scroll, but this does not seem to have been in use in the earliest times. Many of the phenomena suggest that originally large portions of the literature were preserved in the form of a series of short books—possibly written on the skins of burnt offerings which under Leviticus vii. 8 fall to the priest. Thus we read in Genesis v. 1. This is the *book* of the generations of Adam, and colophons are very numerous in some parts of the Pentateuch, especially in Leviticus.

Practical convenience would have been strongly on the same side. A priest who had to advise on some point, say of leprosy or sacrificial law, would find the task very much easier if the legislation were preserved in a series of short writings with labels protruding, so that he could readily find the particular passage he required, than if he had to roll away at one large scroll beginning with Genesis

[5]See "The International Standard Bible Encyclopædia," *s. v.* Number.

i. 1 till he reached the relevant portion of Leviticus or possibly Deuteronomy.

And looking broadly at the Pentateuch as we have it, we can see that many of its phenomena are best explained by the supposition that at an earlier stage of its history it was preserved as a library of short writings which on being transcribed in scroll form were not always placed in the correct order.[6] In the case of the laws no practical harm results.

It may be obvious that in Leviticus and Numbers the arrangement of the various legal pericopes is often haphazard, but this does not affect the practical sense conveyed. If certain procedure is to be observed in the case of a Nazarite, or if particular legislative provisions deal with land, the force is the same whether we find the material laws sandwiched in between widely different topics or placed in a well-considered order. But when we come to narrative wholly different considerations apply.

Suppose that we were dependent for our knowledge of the Napoleonic age on a single history and that by some accident the account of one of Napoleon's great victories—say Austerlitz or Jena—were placed after Waterloo, the result from a historical point of view would be baffling in the extreme. Something of this kind seems to have happened more than once in the transmission of the books of the Hebrew Bible.

Thus the notices relating to the tent of meeting in the Pentateuch are not in order. The passage that contains the first notice of the judicial practice of Moses (Ex. xxxiii. 7-11) stands much too late and surrounded by matter with which it has no connection. On the other hand it is presupposed by narratives which in the present arrangement stand earlier. Thus Exodus xxiv. 14, with

---

[6]See further "Contributions to a New Theory of the Composition of the Pentateuch," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1918-20.

its scheme for the provisional transaction of judicial work during the absence of Moses on the mount, clearly contemplates that the habit of submitting disputes to him had already arisen, and Jethro's remarks and suggestions in Exodus xviii. are called forth by the fact that the arrangement was in full working order and imposed an excessive burden on the leader. Here all that is necessary is to place Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 immediately after Exodus xiii., which seems to have been its original position, and to recognize that Exodus xviii. belongs to the closing scenes of the sojourn at Horeb. Then these narratives can be read consecutively and the arrangements for the trial of cases fall into good order.

The new procedure suggested by Jethro is seen in operation in later passages (Lev. xxiv. 10 ff.; Num. xv. 32 ff., xxvii. 2 ff., xxxvi.). This rearrangement is confirmed by other considerations. In the present order of the text considerable difficulty has been felt as to the *position* of the tent of meeting and the reconciliation of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11, where the tent of meeting is an erection of very simple type, with the far more elaborate structure with which the latter part of Exodus and the two following books familiarize us.

All such problems are solved by the rearrangement. Immediately after the crossing of the Red Sea the tent of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 came into use and stood outside the camp. Ultimately that was superseded by the elaborate sanctuary which was erected after the visits to the Mount and stood in the middle of the camp: "And there I will meet with thee and I will commune with thee" (Ex. xxv. 22). This now became the tent of meeting, and so it is that we find Moses and his colleagues sitting in the center of the camp at the door of the tent of meeting in the later passages. Once more Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 introduces us to Joshua, but Exodus xvii. 9 regards him as already known (cf. xxiv. 13, xxxii. 17). This too is explained once

we recognize that Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 should stand before Exodus xiv.[7]

An interesting and important instance of the power of rearrangement to remedy some of the most inveterate difficulties of the biblical text is furnished by certain chapters of Numbers. As the text stands we find a number of extraordinary difficulties of which it is sufficient to mention the following. "*The* Hormah" is spoken of in Numbers xiv. 45 as already known, while a subsequent passage (xxi. 3) first explains the giving of the name. Moses, after receiving a divine command to turn *to-morrow* (Num. xiv 25), proceeds to ignore it without rebuke or punishment for the period of time required for all the transactions narrated in the portions of the history which at present lie before the narrative of the execution of the command in Numbers xxi. 4.

According to the *present form of the narrative of Numbers, the Israelites appear* to have spent at Kadesh the thirty-eight years which, according to Deuteronomy i. 40, ii. 1, 14, were really consumed in wandering. Moses, after receiving a command to turn southward immediately (Num. xiv. 25), endeavors to obviate the necessity of this march by seeking permission to cut across Edom. Yet this disobedience is recorded without any hint that it was a defiance of an earlier divine command or other sign of disapproval! The geography of the wanderings is extraordinarily eccentric with the cut across Edom from Kadesh to Mount Hor and the doubling back to the neighborhood of Hormah. Strangely enough, too, the Israelites after receiving the command to turn southward from Kadesh and suffering a grievous defeat in the Negeb to the north, wage a successful campaign in that same northern district (embracing the very scene of their defeat) as a preliminary to turning south! Then immediate-

[7] See further *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1914, pages 596 ff.

ly after winning a signal victory in the Negeb (Num. xxi. 1-3) with no other reason than the divine command which they had ignored with impunity for thirty-eight years, they suddenly evacuate the conquered territory and turn southward to the Gulf of Akabah.

These and other difficulties all find their solution in the scientific application of textual criticism. It would take us too long to prove the matter in detail here. Those who are interested must study it further in the literature to which references are given below.[8] But the order of the narrative is Numbers xii., xx. 1, 14-21, xxi. 1-3, xiii., xiv., xvi.-xviii., xx. 2-13, 22a, xxi. 4b-9, then a gap followed by xx. 22b-29, xxi. 4a. In Numbers xx. 1 "third" should be read with some Greek authorities for the Hebrew "first"; in xxxiii. 38 "first" should be substituted with the Syriac and the Sahidic for "fifth"; and in xx. 23 we should restore "in the mountain country of the land of Moab." The itinerary in Numbers xxxiii. is a rewriting of old materials that were in a fragmentary condition and does not preserve the correct order of the stations.

Similarly in the prophetic literature it is generally recognized that Zechariah xiii. 7-9 should immediately follow xi. to which it belongs, and that Isaiah v. 25 ff. is the sequel to ix.

II. The Pentateuch.

We may now treat of certain matters which have affected the Pentateuch far more than the prophets. Something has been said of textual criticism, and illustrations have been given of one or two of its branches. It is impossible in the space at our disposal to deal with all the matters that require attention in this connection, but there is one peculiar department of the subject that has had a strange influence on the study of the Bible. Scholarly

[8] See "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," 114-138, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1918, April and October, 1919, July, 1920, 334 ff.

ideas and ideals vary in different ages, and there was one which seems to have held sway over the minds of the guardians of the text in a way that has had very strange consequences.

A modern seeking to do his best for an ancient text would hold that he could most efficiently discharge the task by preserving its *ipsissima verba.* But some old scholars seem to have taken a different view. They appear to have regarded certain passages as commands to effect emendations. For instance, in Joshua viii. 12 there are two readings, Bethel and Bethaven. The reason for this is to be sought in Amos v. 5, "Bethel shall become Aven." This was taken by some to be universally applicable, and so Bethel was changed to Bethaven. Similarly in Judges ii. 5 we read, "They called the name of that place Bochim." The real name of the place preserved in the Greek text of ii. 1 was Bethel; but the Hebrew has regarded verse 5 as a direction, or at any rate an authority, to alter this, and therefore writes Bochim. In Judges ix. 46 Greek authorities still preserve "Baal" for Masoretic "El."

While these cases are generally admitted, the new part of my theory consists in the view that the principle has been much more widely applied. Thus in Genesis xxxviii. 15 I hold that *qedeshah* (hierodule) has been removed (cf. 21 f.) in deference to Deuteronomy xxiii. 18, and that the word "baal" was common in all the early Old Testament books, and has frequently been supplanted by "Elohim," etc. A few instances may be given: in Deuteronomy xxxiii. 12 I restore "his Baal" for the meaningless "on him" (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1918, pages 238 ff.); in 1 Kings xxii. 6, 2 Chronicles xviii. 5, "the baal" as the god of Ahab's prophets; so, too, in the explanations of Baal-perazim (2 Sam. v. 19-21, 1 Chron. xiv. 10-12) and Reuben (Reubel) (Gen. xxix. 32); in most of the cases where Kings and Chronicles differ as to the name of God;

in Judges ix. 7 (a case that is particularly clear on the context and literary considerations); in Exodus iv. 24-26 (for no Hebrew historian would have told that God tried to kill a man and failed); in Genesis xiii. 13 (since the men of Sodom cannot have sinned against a deity of whom they had never heard); in 1 Samuel xxix. 6 (which seems to me to have been affected by Jeremiah xii. 16), and in numerous other passages. "Baal" was commonly used of the God of Israel in early times, and sometimes the reference is to him, and at other times to some other deity.

While many of these changes have been comparatively unimportant, others have created great critical difficulties. It is possible that they are in the main responsible for the alternation between the divine appellations in Genesis which gave the initial impulse to the documentary theory. This theory, though still widely held, has been entirely exploded in scholarly argument, and is now being gradually abandoned by the more enlightened leaders of critical opinion. To this principle, too, we may look for the explanation of some anachronisms. If Bochim stands for Bethel in Judges ii. 1, because of verse 5, then we may reasonably suppose that similarly the presence of the name Dan in Genesis xiv. 14 is due to Judges xviii. 29 and stands for an original Laish.

Great trouble has been introduced into biblical studies by the refusal of philologists and theologians who were absolutely devoid of legal knowledge or training to recognize that law, and particularly ancient law, is a technical subject. The result has been that Mosaic enactments which are perfectly genuine and consistent have been thought to be contradictory and late forgeries; and when their blunders have been pointed out the critics have obstinately refused to listen to legal opinion.

It is necessary to state this clearly, because the most erroneous statements are habitually made in a most confident and dogmatic manner by men who are really

not competent to deal with any legal subject and would be the first to recognize this truth in any matter in which their personal interests were concerned.

A couple of instances may be taken. Exodus xxxiii. 10 f. contains a tillage regulation, Deuteronomy xv. 1-6 a law of debts. Nobody who had any experience in legal matters or legislation would dream of confusing these two topics. They are entirely distinct and stand in no relation to each other. But critics have been found to argue solemnly that Exodus and Deuteronomy must be from different hands because the one passage does not refer to the other. And nothing will induce them to submit the matter to competent legal opinion.

Again in ancient societies there were several causes of slavery, capture in war, birth of a slave mother, insolvency, and so on. Moses enacted that where an Israelite freeman became insolvent, certain consequences were to follow which were designed to save him from the worst effects of *de jure* slavery (Lev. xxv. 39 ff.). The passage applies only to such freemen and to no other class whatever. Yet it has been argued that this conflicts with Exodus xxi. 2, which deals with Hebrew *slaves* acquired by purchase and has no application whatever to insolvent freemen. To any trained lawyer it is clear that such contentions will not hold water for a moment, but there is no way of inducing the critics to submit legal questions to experts.[9]

Matters are no better in the case of the sacrificial law. Here the main critical contention is strongly reminiscent of the well-known story of the Emperor's new clothes.

[9] I have repeatedly challenged them to take this course and I trust that any reader who is interested will take every possible opportunity of daring any higher critics he knows to submit pages 8-15 of my "Main Problem of Deuteronomy" (Bibliotheca Sacra Company, Oberlin, Ohio) to the law faculty of some university of standing and publishing their opinion.

Julius Wellhausen found in the Bible a number of passages that related to rough altars of earth or unhewn stone which could be used by laymen for certain customary sacrifices recognized and permitted by Moses to continue on the traditional lines. Had he been content to call these altars, and been careful to remember their structure, no harm could have resulted. Unfortunately he and his followers have dubbed them "sanctuaries," "places of sacrifice," etc., and then forgotten of what they were speaking.

But the law also recognizes a house of God side by side with the lay altars. It too had an altar, but this was an entirely different structure from the altars of earth or unhewn stone. It was made of materials which permitted it to have horns—an impossibility in the case of stone which was not hewn—and was of elaborate and detailed construction, so that no contemporary could possibly have confused it with a lay altar.

That a legislator should contemplate the existence side by side of one central house of God possessing a horned altar and a number of lay altars in use all over the country and should enact that only certain sacrifices could be offered at the house (which was a sanctuary) while permitting the use of the lay altars (which were not sanctuaries) for some other gifts is perfectly comprehensible and natural. Without some such arrangement the results must have been very deplorable from a religious point of view in an age when most worship was sacrificial and there were continual temptations to serve other gods. But for the lay altars all over the country the sacrificial worship of the God of Israel would have been impossible except at seasons of pilgrimage for all except those who lived within reach of the central sanctuary. On the other hand the pilgrimages operated to keep the people in touch with the true teaching as to religion.

But once the lay altars are wrongly called and thought

of as sanctuaries the direst confusion results. Yet it is mainly on the basis of this that Wellhausen and his disciples have rewritten the history of Israel. For many years now the critics have been challenged, not once but repeatedly, to meet the exposure of the Wellhausen case in the sixth chapter of "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" point by point. They have always refrained from doing so because they cannot: but very, very gradually first one critic and then another is slowly admitting that there is a distinction between the two kinds of altars.

It is impossible within the limits of space at my disposal to deal completely with either the Wellhausen theory or the Pentateuchal question, but those who desire full discussions will find them in the literature cited below, which the critics have clearly shown that they cannot answer.[10]

III. The Prophets.

In the prophetic literature the question of integrity turns less on problems of authorship than of inspiration. It is possible to hold that the prophet of consolation who wrote Isaiah xl., etc., is a different person from Isaiah of Jerusalem and yet to maintain that his work bears indubitable traces of divine influence. It is true that there is a criticism which delights in assigning small portions of prophetic books—some words or a verse or a few verses—to otherwise unknown prophets and editors; but when the matter is carefully considered it will appear that even if this criticism were sound it would have very little bearing on the matter with which we are concerned.

Suppose for the sake of argument that a passage which is assigned to A was really written by B and that modern

[10]See "Studies in Biblical Law," "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," "The Origin of the Pentateuch," "Pentateuchal Studies," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1914-21 (inclusive), "The International Standard Bible Encyclopædia," and the legal articles in "Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary."

criticism has been successful in proving this. As a rule it will be found that the oracle which has been shown to proceed from B contains some marvelous prediction which has been borne out by events. In such a case the net result is to give us two prophets of truth, A and B, instead of the one (A only) whom tradition had recognized. Now, it is impossible to argue that you have a revelation in the Old Testament if there be only the one prophet of truth recognized by tradition, but that you cease to have a revelation if you have the two prophets of truth postulated by criticism.

The question of revelation turns not on the number or names of its bearers, but on the quality of the work. If there are oracles which no man could have given without divine assistance, our case is established, and it is immaterial whether the oracles proceed from one man or ten or a hundred.

For these reasons we need not trouble about questions of authorship, but may confine ourselves to glancing at some of the evidence for inspiration. One remarkable instance, that of Ezekiel's prediction against Tyre, has already been before us. There are other oracles regarding Tyre which have been literally fulfilled, but they are perhaps of less general interest. Yet one little touch may be mentioned. In Isaiah xxiii. 12 we read: "Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed virgin daughter of Zidon: arise, pass over to Kittim [Cyprus]; even there shalt thou have no rest." Esarhaddon in narrating his conquest of Zidon makes the following statement: "Abdmilkot its king, who had fled into the sea before my arms, I drew him like a fish out of the sea and cut off his head." That is the best commentary alike on the meaning and on the inspiration of the prophet. Those who care to see how the predictions against foreign nations were realized will find the necessary material in the fifth chapter of "The Prophets of Israel in History and Criti-

cism." Here it will be of interest to take some of the predictions relating to the people of Israel.

It is not generally realized that after the disruption of the united kingdom and the fall of Samaria two reunions of representatives of Israel with Judah actually took place, but there is plenty of evidence to establish the facts. It is well to look into these matters, because they form the themes of many predictions. The first occurrence was in circa 625 B.C. When the Assyrians had overwhelmed Israel they had made two great deportations (in 732 and 722 B.C. respectively), but many of the inhabitants remained in the land together with the settlers who were established in it by the Assyrians. From that time onward Northern Israel remained an Assyrian province until the Scythians invaded the empire and overran it to the borders of Egypt. This invasion cost Assyria the whole west, and after the Scythians had disappeared Josiah of Judah extended his dominion to the north. That is how Bethel, one of the seats of the calf worship and the scene of the ministry of Amos, and cities of Samaria came to form part of his kingdom (2 Kings xxiii. 4, 15 ff.), and these became so true to their faith and their allegiance, that we find men of Bethel and Ai figuring in the list of those who later returned from the Babylonian exile (Ezra ii. 28; Neh. vii. 32).

Soon after this incorporation of the north in the Southern kingdom came Josiah's reformation (623 B.C.). This was based on the finding of the book of the law with its declaration, "Ye are children of the Lord your God" (Deut. xiv. 1), and its emphasis on the relationship of God and people. This was as nearly as possible a century after the destruction of the Northern kingdom.

So it came to pass that the prediction of Hosea was fulfilled and the children of Israel after sojourning many days without the accessories of monarchy or their sacrificial institutions returned and sought the Lord their God

and David their king (*i. e.*, the reigning representative of the House of David). In the place where it had been said unto them, "Ye are not my people," it was said unto them, "Ye are the sons of the living God" [cf. Hos. iii. 4 f., ii. 1-3 (i. 10-ii. 1)]. And the story of the men of Bethel shows how they were "betrothed unto God," not for the brief period of the reformation, but permanently [cf. Hos. ii. 21 (19)].

After the Babylonian exile there was a further reunion, this time with descendants of the Israelites who had been deported by the Assyrians. We know from an inscription of Cyrus that the Persians entirely reversed the policy of deportation which had been followed by the Assyrians and Chaldeans. Their method of treating the subject peoples contrasted most favorably in its humanity and enlightement with that adopted by their predecessors. Cyrus returned the various gods which had been carried away to their original shrines, and he adds the words, "All the people assembled and returned them to their dwellings."

Thus it comes about that the statements in the post-exilic documents which on their face imply a restoration of the representatives of the twelve tribes are supported by the archæological evidence. Zechariah viii. 13 is addressed to the Hosea of Judah and the House of Israel (compare Malachi ii. 11). Ezra vi. 16 f. is really not open to doubt, and according to Ezra vi. 21 f. there were children of Israel who had come with the permission of the king of Assyria. In that phrase "king" is used as often elsewhere in the Bible to denote viceroy.[11] It would seem that after the exile the number of Israelites who returned was small as compared with that of the Jews. The latter were undoubtedly predominant in the community, but

[11] See "The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism," page 99, note.

this is in accordance with the prediction of Jeremiah. It is difficult to read his language in iii. 12 ff. without feeling that he was in touch with the exiled Israelites. The return he foretells is on a small scale, only "one of a city and two of a family" (verse 14). And the other details of the oracle were fulfilled. The Ark no longer existed (iii. 16), and in time the postexilic community was to be strengthened by the gathering of converts from all nations to Jerusalem.

To take but one more of the many predictions that relate to these matters we may glance at Isaiah xi. 11-16. Judah and Ephraim did return and there was no further strife between them. Under the Maccabees the peoples to whom the prophet alludes were in fact conquered as he foretold. If verse 15 is couched in the language of poetry, there is the substantial truth to warrant it that after the exile the Jewish restoration was effected under the best conditions of security of travel known to that epoch.

It is however necessary to utter a word of warning as to the work of the prophets. Careful study shows that their art, like other arts, was subject to its own special conventions, and these are not always apparent on the face of the oracles to those who have not read themselves into the spirit of the age. It must always be remembered that in this respect contemporaries enjoyed two advantages which are denied to us. When an art is living and bearing fruit, some general knowledge of its conventions will be widely diffused. And further there will always be the possibility of supplementing that general knowledge by inquiry. Hence we must not wonder if contemporaries sometimes understood oracles in a sense that would not at first sight suggest itself to those who approach them without this advantage.

One conspicuous instance of this may be mentioned. Predictions of disaster were habitually subject to a qualification which is occasionally expressed, but more often

implied. It was that effective repentance would avail to avert or modify the threatened evil. A very clear instance of this is provided by Micah's threats against Jerusalem. To all appearance Micah iii. 12 is absolutely unqualified in its announcement of impending doom. Yet we know from Jeremiah xxvi. 19 that contemporaries understood it as subject to a qualification and that their understanding was correct. Thus we sometimes find a prophet threatening unconditionally and in another oracle threatening with the qualification that effective repentance may earn forgiveness (cf. Jer. xxv. and xxxvi.). This is a mere matter of the choice of language. In virtue of the general law which was perfectly well known there would be no difference in the meaning conveyed to contemporaries.

Of equal importance to the understanding of the prophetic oracles is a correct appreciation of the handling of the time element. Here there are several principles and it would take us too long to consider them in detail. It may be said generally, however, that while time, like any other detail, might be a matter of essential importance, this is not always so. If the gift of an oracle was that something was to happen within a particular time, then of course we are justified in taking the time element strictly. But in very many cases the prophets deliberately acted on another principle. Looking at the true inwardness of events, they were able to see a connection in fact or in thought between occurrences that were widely separated in time, and combined with their methods of expression this often leads modern leaders astray. To us it would be perfectly intelligible to say, "Babylon, Moab, and other countries may flourish now and win great successes at the expense of Judah, but they stand for nothing enduring and will perish sooner or later; on the other hand, Judah is the bearer of certain great and permanent principles. Whatever reverses may befall it,

ultimately it, or rather that portion of it which is true to its best ideals, will continue to live and will survive these powers of a day." That is often the meaning of the prophets: but their methods of expression are very different and have consequently led to misunderstandings which are not unnatural when the difference in the intellectual and literary atmosphere of our own age is borne in mind.[12]

[12]It is impossible to pursue these matters further, but as full discussion of the topics relevant to the rationalist attack will be found in my "Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism."

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 6

Archæology versus Wellhausenism

By

PROF. ERNEST SELLIN

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1925

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 4.—"Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" Clearly Attested Facts Showing That the Destructive "Assured Results of Modern Scholarship" Are Indefensible. By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Semitic Philology in Princeton Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 5.—"The Integrity of the Old Testament," by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law (London); Author of "The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism," "The Origin of the Pentateuch," "Pentateuchal Studies," "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," "Studies in Biblical Law," etc. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 6.—"Archæology Vs. Wellhausenism; or, In What Respect Have the Foundations of the Religio-Historical System of Wellhausen Been Proven Unstable by Modern Researches in the Ancient Orient?" By Professor Ernest Sellin (Berlin). With an Introduction by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1923, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER SIX.

Archæology *Vs.* Wellhausenism; or, In What Respect Have the Foundations of the Religio-Historical System of Wellhausen Been Proven Unstable by Modern Researches in the Ancient Orient?

BY PROFESSOR ERNEST SELLIN (BERLIN).

With Introduction by the Editor.

VI.

INTRODUCTION.

The courteous compliance of Professor Sellin with the request of the Editor to contribute a number to the "Aftermath Series" is an event in the history of our denominational literature, and, we believe, will have its effect upon American thought in general. It is a candle which cannot be hid under a denominational bushel.

Professor Sellin, as our readers know, enjoys a primacy amongst the living Orientalists of Germany, having been personally and influentially connected with a number of the most modern exploration movements in Palestine and other parts of the ancient Orient. His rank amongst Semitic scholars is also that of first authority. No man in the world, we think, is better qualified than he to discuss the subject on which he writes in the following pages. It also happens that the results of recent Oriental research have brought the methods of the higher critical school to a crux, especially as to its construction of the history of Old Testament religion. When, therefore, the sum of Wellhausenism, as the chief definitive of this construction, shall have been brought to a total, our appraisement of Professor Sellin's discussion will stand beyond question.

Thousands of our ministers, young and old, as also a multitude of our intelligent laymen, we are sure, will esteem it a privilege to have this valuable writing placed so conveniently and inexpensively within their reach. The time has fully come when some independent inquiry and thinking should be done by those who, up to this time, have patiently and all but dumbly accepted the conclusions of the higher critics.

The discussion of Professor Sellin follows logically upon

the arguments which have gone before in this series, touching the Levitical priesthood, the codes of Josiah and Ezra, and the status of the Old Testament writings as determined by internal linguistic evidence. Professor Sellin not only shows the instability of the foundations on which Wellhausen has based his theories excluding Moses from Pentateuchal authorship and activities, but demonstrates to a certainty that conditions existed in the fifteenth to the thirteenth centuries B.C. which were favorable to the Mosaic theocracy, with its traditional details of priesthood, worship, and sacrifice, as also its legal and historical writings, as found in the Pentateuch. This showing tremendously climaxes the argument of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, also presented in this series, that the internal linguistic and idiomatic evidence of the Pentateuch shows that it could not have been written at the times and in the places to which Wellhausen and his fellow critics have assigned it. *Per contra*, the evidence is equally strong that it *was* written by Moses, and at the time and in the place claimed by tradition.

At the outset, Professor Sellin expresses a due appreciation of the seriousness and directness of Wellhausen's method, a method characteristic of the destructive school in general. He perceives that Wellhausen was shut up to his method by the logic and philosophical bias of his time. Monistic evolution and the Hegelian *a priori* principle were regnant in the schools of his century. As a radical investigator, he had no choice; he was both the bondman and the mouthpiece of transmutative monism. And besides, archæology and Oriental research were but beginning to lisp the speech which they were later to utter in its fullness. Wellhausen was as one who set forth on his way before the full dawn of day. When the open day arrived, it found him old and inactive, and its light rather blinded than helped him in the entanglements of his misadventure.

The method of Wellhausen sought to construe within strictly scientific limits the whole religious history of the people of Israel. The laws of biological development are not more exact than the lines on which this is meant to be worked out. The fascination of this plan for the scholar and student is beyond question, as Professor Sellin has pointed out. It explains the defection from traditional faith of so vast a body of recent-day theologians. It, however, left no basis for a divine revelation; no sphere for the administration of the personal God of the universe. It was nicely scientific in its day; but, as Professor Sellin shows, it does not comport with an array of overwhelming archæological facts now being presented in support of the claims of the Old Testament. The said Old Testament "in the light of to-day" is being testified to by a history in "the yesterdays of old" which is only confusion for the destructive critics and their imitators.

The reader will constantly bear in mind that Professor Sellin's argument covers those aspects of the Wellhausen hypothesis which must at last be verified or discredited by the testimony of archæology. At the time when the Graf-Wellhausen theory was taking final shape in the rejection of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the relegation of Israelitish legislation and literature to a period immediately antedating and following the Babylonian exile, the racial and archæological map of the ancient world was thought to have been finished. A fairly industrious student might have mastered the details of this map during odd hours of application. This map showed the following:

The forbears of the Hebrew race, a generation or two before Abraham, had come, as a nomadic Bedouin group, out of northern Arabia. Abraham—if indeed there were a historic Abraham—dwelt in Palestine as a letterless sheik amongst an uncultured and fetish-worshiping people. There was, at this time, little or no thought communication between Palestine and the valleys of the Tigris and

Euphrates. Later, in Egypt, the descendants of Abraham preserved their Bedouin characteristics, the civilization of Egypt itself being provincial and possessing but few elements of culture and uplift.

With the scantiest possible recognition of the traditional story, Wellhausen brings Moses and his tribal kinsmen to the escarpment of Mount Sinai. These tribal kinsmen of Moses are without even the rudiments of their future monotheistic faith—offspring of a desert ancestry, who, finding themselves in the desert, quickly revert to ancestral type and habits. Here Moses sows in their life the seeds of monotheism; he could scarcely do more than deposit the seeds, for the world that lay about him was desert, insensate, barbarous, and devoid of the conditions of civilization and religion.

Beyond a spoken torah, consisting of a handful of precepts and statutes, Moses gave no laws to the tribes. The working out and engrossing of a legislation are not to be thought of as possible. It is all but asserted that both the means and the skill of writing were non-existent. The Levitical priesthood, the tabernacle, and the ark were historical afterthoughts, while the written law was the finality and not the beginning of Hebrew nationality.

With the primordial of "Jehovah for Israel, and Israel for Jehovah," the tribes, after a struggle, entered Canaan to settle alongside those people of the land who were left unconquered, and, in a large way, to adopt their religious and ethical ideals to assist in the evolution of their own. The result was a fitful ebb and flow of national life, with a distinctly monotheistic faith templed in the inane of their future consciousness. In the meantime, traditional oral torahs, legends, and folk heroics constituted the national claim to a literature.

Upon this inertia, or halting development, broke the prophets with their burdens of judgment, warning, and promise. Monotheism then began to take, for the first

time, a definite form, a *per saltum* of the long-drawn "development." This was the "ethical religion," which preceded the legal codes. The prophets of the Northern Kingdom of Israel were the pioneers in national literature. To one of their schools, about 750 B.C., the beginnings of national history are to be traced. Under self-announced prophetic authority, rudimentary law codes began to be reduced to writing.

But now the political end of the nation approached. In almost the hour of national dissolution, an enterprising ecclesiastic, Hilkiah, with the aid of confederates, fabricated a body of laws—the most considerable draft hitherto attempted—and delivered it to Josiah, the last Israelitish king worthy to bear that title, as a book of laws "spoken by the hand of Moses." The long night of inanition had passed, and now Israel was able to write, though under a pretense which, if made to stand in proof, can only discredit every page of the Hebrew Scriptures.

In the Babylonian bondage Israel came into direct contact with the life, laws, and religion of that land. According to Wellhausen's theory, it was Israel's first opportunity to know the world thoughts and world faith represented in Babylonian literature. As a result, the tribes returned from their exile with an extensive law code, fabricated in the house of bondage, and again attributed to Moses, "the man of God." They also brought back a cosmology and a race history in which, as in an "envelope," was later inclosed the alleged Mosaic legislation. This was the real origin of the Pentateuch, and in no small measure of other parts of the Hebrew canon.

This we believe to be a fair summary of the teachings of the so-called higher critical school of Old Testament science, as it had developed up to the close of the late World War. But now the whole state of the case is changed and changing. Archæology has dissipated the illusion of a north Arabian Bedouin ancestry of the Israel-

itish tribes, and has placed that ancestry on a parity with the cultured and settled Hittites of the north. The supposed cultureless and semibarbarous age of Moses, upon which Wellhausen seems so much to have relied for the support of his theory of non-Mosaic writing and achievement, has been pushed back a thousand years, and the lawgiver is seen to have appeared at the noontide of an age of ancient learning and religious inquiry. It was a period quite favorable to the legislative and administrative achievements recorded in the Pentateuch, and also to the gathering of the cosmological and historical materials therein reduced to clarity and coherence. Indeed, the new evidence strongly tends to show that these things must needs have been accomplished in the Mosaic age. The probability of their having been done a thousand years later decreases in a ratio that spells discomfiture to those who have challenged the record.

It will be seen that Professor Sellin deals with the cold, compelling facts of his science; criticism meets criticism; research lays a resistless hand upon pragmatism. The enemies of Old Testament integrity are answered with their own arguments; Goliath is beheaded with his own weapon. The cause of truth can be satisfied with no other kind of defense.

We may now call attention to two other matters adverted to in Professor Sellin's spirited discussion. The first of these relates to the use which Moses and the other Old Testament writers made of the literary productions of other peoples, and especially of the class of writings generally described as myths and legends. We could wish that Professor Sellin had given us some extended paragraphs on this; and yet in his brief notice of it he is very clear and strong as to his belief. He agrees with Dr. Robert Dick Wilson that Moses freely used original documents. These two eminent men are also agreed that when such documents are used they are made to accord with

the standards of the monotheistic faith. Thus, as Professor Sellin says, "any child can see" that the creation and flood stories of Genesis suggest the periphery and also some slight details of stories relating to the same events found in the Assyrian tablet writings. Yet the differences are so great, both as to the action and the human consciousness which they represent, that they cannot be thought of as being derived through a common process. Their reduction to the form in which we find them in Genesis has involved the operative offices of both revelation and inspiration.

Concerning this phenomenon, Professor Sellin is clear and confident, holding to a divine inspiration which covers this and other points in the literature and creed of the theocracy of Moses. His own definition of this inspiration is that of "the unique experience of a mighty prophetic personality, who, as later tradition lispingly tells, saw God face to face and had spoken to him by word of mouth, as may here be ventured."

On our own account, we here set down a long-matured thought on this point, a thought greatly enhanced by the exhibits made in Professor Sellin's paper. Our thought is, that it is not proper to speak of the Genesis stories as having been derived from Assyrian sources, as such, but rather from remoter originals, which were a common heritage of the Semitic nations and families. The new horizon created by recent Oriental researches gives ample background for such a thought.

Furthermore, if the Genesis stories were written in the Mosaic age—and there is now no longer ground for doubt on this point—they are nearly a thousand years older than the copies of the creation and flood stories found in the library at Nineveh, from which the critics believe them to have been taken. This puts the burden of proof on the Nineveh stories, and not on those of Genesis. The periphery and the slight resemblances to Genesis point to an original known to Moses and the patriarchs; and, as

Professor Sellin has shown, it is not impossible that the contents of this source document may have been known and taught in Egypt during and before the time of Moses.

The same is true concerning the Mosaic laws. The resemblance of these laws to those of the Hammurabic code is noteworthy and interesting; but, upon investigation, the resemblances do not prove significant as to a common origin. It is only clear that each represents, in its own way, that world consciousness and record of human order which go far back into the millenniums before the Babylonian exile. It is a degrading vassalage of thought to tie any part of the Bible—the only real world book ever written—to a derivation from the polytheistic myths of Nineveh. There is a safer and a more accordant conclusion. These stories were written in a world epoch—open on each of its four sides—to be a manual for world faith and thought. That a divine superintendency and inspiration attended their writing is abundantly witnessed on their face. The human process was natural; the divine process was complete. The output was the "unique experience of a mighty, prophetic personality."

The other point made in Professor Sellin's essay to which we are to refer relates to that current of inspired and spiritual consciousness which prevailed in Israel from the time of Moses to the prophets, resulting in the final extirpation of idolatry and the settlement of the nation in the hope of the coming of Messiah. Professor Sellin traces four currents in the religious life of Israel: first, the unadulterated idolatry of Canaan, to which so large a body of the people was enticed; second, the old El religion, a recrudescence of the cult of the pre-patriarchal days in Canaan, when certain deities of the terrestrial high places were worshiped. (This is frequently, though never definitely, referred to in the tribal and national history of Israel); third, the priest religion, a defection of the priests, who held to the Mosaic ritual, but compromised, for ad-

vantage, with some of the customs of the Canaanites; fourth, the pastoral or prophet religion. This last was the faith within the faiths of Israel. It made no compromise, but "clung firmly to the divine words of the founder of the religion; it declared war against the entire culture of Canaan, and sought to preserve in its purity the holy heritage of the past."

The promoters of this current of religion represented "a progressive chain of charismatic personalities" from Moses to Malachi, not always writing or speaking prophets, but always living a testimony of inspiration and spiritual power. This was the true and proper religion of Israel, out of which came the words of spoken and written inspiration, the Scriptures of the canon, and by which the Day of Messiah was brought nigh. The representatives of this current were the men to whom God spoke, and through whom he fulfilled himself in the history of Israel. The other currents were abortive, of the flesh and of idols, and are not to be accounted in a history of Israel's true faith. They were not developments of the religion of Moses, but contradictions of the plainest of its precepts.

Professor Sellin holds that, outside the traditional record that Moses was born in Egypt, and was there instructed under the highest conditions of its culture, he had somewhere—and that somewhere, by every token, in Egypt—heard of divine beings of world power and authority. The sense of a divine unity was basic in him. This puts the tradition of Hebrew monotheism on an indubitable foundation. The only way to escape the logic of the situation is to deny altogether the historicity of Moses. The knowledge of a world God, who was Creator and Lord, was a light which had come into the whole of Western Asia and Egypt through circulation in the cuneiform writing of the pantheon lists of Babylon and other countries. Polytheism could exist even then amongst the intelligent only as a choice of creeds, and not as a cultural necessity.

It is here that the rationale of the Mosaic religion comes in. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses chose monotheism out of an ethical and emotional consciousness, helped by divine inspiration.

There are, however, not wanting instances in the Abrahamic-Mosaic age of the monotheistic consciousness, having emerged upon the lower plane of a purely intellectual process. Amen-Hotep, the so-called "heretic king" of Egypt, is a brilliant example. This Amen-Hotep, a Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty, who reigned in the century just preceding that of Moses, is, by the monuments, clearly shown to have abolished the polytheistic cult of Egypt and introduced in its stead the worship of Aten, "the only god of Egypt representing the principle of monotheism." The resistance of the priests of the old religion was so great that the king removed his capital from Thebes to a new site, Khut Aton, now forever famous as the repository for three thousand years of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. With the end of the reign of Amen-Hotep IV., Egypt reverted to its ancient polytheistic creed; but this record of a monotheistic interregnum in Egypt just before the Mosaic age is of tremendous significance to the defense of the Old Testament. It answers a thousand cavils of pragmatism.

A book just published in America, "The Times of Tut-Ankh-Amen," by Bishara Nahas, an Egyptian scholar, an authority on Egyptology and interested in excavations in his native land, sets in fresh and interesting light some of the facts of this history. The writer says: "Amen-Hotep (renamed Akhen-Aton) owed his ideas of independence mostly to his mother, Queen Thyi, and his wife, Queen Nefertiti, who were princesses of Mitani of Northern Syria. They probably taught him the monotheistic ideal, which they brought from the Asiatic lands."

Continuing, Mr. Nahas says: "The foundations of

the so-called Akhen-Aton heresy is the revolt of a broad-minded Pharaoh against polytheism. Akhen-Aton worshiped the essence of God himself, and represented him on monuments under his tangible manifestation of the sun giving life to the world. The Aten idea may have originated from the idea of the Jehovah of the Hebrews, with whom the Pharaohs were then in close contact. The beautiful hymn addressed to Aton, and said to have been composed by Akhen-Aton himself, is permeated by the idea of the One Creator, and would not be out of place in the Bible."

This Akhen-Aton was in constant correspondence, during his reign, with provincial governors in Palestine, then tributary to Egypt, as is shown by the several hundred clay tablets found at Tel-el-Amarna. It was also under his reign that the tablet referred to by Professor Sellin, as having been meant for use as a textbook or study copy, was brought into Egypt. It is of crowning interest to note here that this tablet carried a Babylonian cultic composition! How many other such tablets, not surviving, may have been brought into the land, nobody knows, nobody can guess. Professor Sellin seems to hold that many writings of this character found their way thither, and that they produced a definite and lasting influence upon the religious thought of the people.

The suggestion that Akhen-Aton's monotheistic impulse may have originated from his knowledge of the Jehovah of the Hebrews, a people then two millions strong in his kingdom, is, as Professor Sellin would say, not a florid fancy. Joseph, the great patron of his family, had lived a long lifetime near the Egyptian throne, and had exercised a nearly boundless influence on the life of the nation. Taking the traditional record as a basis, this influence had lingered after his death quite to the end of the eighteenth dynasty, or well beyond the reign of Amen-

Hotep, even beyond that of his successor, Tut-Ankh-Amen. The Pharaoh who "knew not Joseph" came in the age which followed. That the influence of Joseph was silently, if not insistently, in favor of the Abrahamic monotheism is certain. That a form of worship was preserved amongst the Hebrew tribes from the time of their advent into Egypt to the time of the exodus can also scarcely be questioned.

We have elsewhere called attention to the fact that there are traces of a rudimentary Levitical headship having existed in the Hebrew community in Egypt almost or quite from the death of Jacob. There is scarcely any other way of explaining the readiness with which the tribes received the embassy of the two Levite brothers, Moses and Aaron. H. M. Wiener has called attention to the phrase, "thy brother, the Levite," found in Exodus, as having a distinctly tribal and traditional significance. Professor Sellin has also verified the archæological evidence that it is "a thought well worth considering" that "Arabic-Egyptian sanctuaries on the Sinaitic peninsula reached back to the time of the third millennium B.C.; that at one of these sanctuaries, dating from long pre-Mosaic times, Levites have always been priests." Thus, from an outside source, a Levitical priesthood of an extra-Israelitish community seems to be proven as existent, at least as early as the time of Moses.

Truly, research in the ancient Orient is throwing a correcting light upon the history of an age sadly confused by the critics. The high point of testimony in this age, now being certified to through Oriental research, is, as Professor Sellin tells us, one "which we cannot get hold of by means of pickax and spade, but which, nevertheless, is present—faith in an invisible, spiritual God."

To every one who loves the hope and promise of the old Book, we recommend a student's study of Professor Sellin's

essay. Do not overlook the fact that it is *scientific.* Take our word for it that it is also a faithful and loyal contribution to the defense of the faith once for all delivered to the saints.*

*Thanks are due the Rev. J. A. B. Rabe for valuable services in the translation of this essay.—*Editor.*

ARCHEOLOGY VERSUS WELLHAUSENISM;

OR,

IN WHAT RESPECT HAVE THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE RELIGIO-HISTORICAL SYSTEM OF WELLHAUSEN BEEN PROVEN UNSTABLE BY MODERN RESEARCHES IN THE ANCIENT ORIENT?

THERE was a time when it was believed that the teachings of Wellhausen were really devoid of a religio-historical system; that he was anything but a systematic scientist; merely a historian to whom we owe a brilliant and novel sketch of the history of the people of Israel. But the further we are removed from the period of time in which this quite brilliant scholar wrote, the clearer becomes a fact which should never have been denied—namely, that Wellhausen had to pay tribute to his time; that he had been intimately connected with certain philosophical and religio-historical conceptions and presuppositions, such as are subject to the constant changes of the years, and indeed that these influenced to a very large extent the aspect of his historical images.[1] And since just those conceptions and presumptions, owing to the modern opening up of the ancient Orient, had to pass through a complete mutation, it is evident that the historical images constructed upon them must undergo a thorough revision.

But in what does that which is peculiar in the religio-historical structure of Wellhausen really consist, in contradistinction from the conceptions of other scholars who surely also, and long before him, attempted to reconstruct the history of Israel in accordance with strictly scientific methods? I should like to settle this question at once in as natural a manner as possible.

[1] M. Kegel has recently stated this in an effective way in his writing, "Los von Wellhausen," 1922.

Wellhausen actually made the simple and dazzling attempt to trace the entire religious history of Israel back to a quite primitive cultic thought of the founder of that religion; to conceive of the worship of Israel as the product of an evolution which had been effected by means of this thought in an altogether natural way. This was, as a matter of course, under the constant operation of political and social history, yet not without the continuous influence of particularly gifted and genial personalities.

Step by step, we see the progress of this asserted development. The whole process goes on before our eyes much as the movements of a properly functioning clockwork. The reader is at once made to receive the impression that it certainly could not have happened otherwise than it did happen, or is alleged to have happened. The beforementioned fundamental thought of Moses, the founder, that primordial cell, so to speak, from which everything else is to be derived, is the simple essential doctrine attributed to Moses: "Jahwe, the God of Israel; Israel, the people of Jahwe."

This people is, first of all, so the Wellhausen hypothesis goes, a Bedouin tribe, and, consequently, its religion is a Bedouin religion; its God a tribal god, such as any tribe of Bedouins might have; perhaps, even at the beginning, possessing a particularly moral and judicial attribute, but, in the main, a nature god with a sphere of power restricted to the boundaries of his people. In Canaan begins a second period. The people are gradually becoming settled, and the Bedouin god therewith becomes a peasant and agricultural god, with his sphere of power in Palestine.

Out of the Canaanitic peasant religion, so the theory continues to instruct us, flow impulses, suggestions, and conceptions into the ancient religion, which enrich it, but which, in turn, very much alter the former image of Jahwe. He is, in part, changed so as to become the Canaanitic Baal. When this Canaanizing process had seem-

ingly reached its highest point, the third period began. A powerful reaction sets in; the prophets of Scripture rend asunder the former bond between Jahwe and Israel; Jahwe is no Baal, but a moral God, and, since Israel has become sinful, Israel must perish. Jahwe, nevertheless, must still live and triumph as the God who rules the world.

Monotheism is, according to the theory, on the way. The prophets remain in the right, with their announcements of coming judgment. The people of Israel, as a nation, are to perish, and with this conjunction the fourth period begins. During the Babylonian exile a mighty revulsion occurs. The whilom announcers of judgment become comforters of the people, prophets of salvation; in a new manner they tie the bond which unites the people with Jahwe; Israel is converted to him and becomes a congregation which perceives its historical task to be his service. In this manner, so it is claimed, was created the Jewish religion of the law whose fathers were Ezra and Ezekiel, and whose charter is found in the priest code of the Pentateuch.

I suppose there is no serious reader of Wellhausen's "History of Israel" upon whom this simple, lucid process of development does not, at first blush, produce an effect which is actually fascinating. Yet, immediately upon finishing the reading, the great and burning question which arises in the minds of many is: "How does it happen that this unique process of progress from the primitive religion of nature to ethical monotheism and to the religion of the world was accomplished only in Israel? Why do we not observe the same thing among nations like Edom, Moab, and those elsewhere, among whom, forsooth, the historic presumptions were the same as with Israel? Why have all these disappeared from the theater of action in history, while Israel's religion and people alone continue to live?

It will ever remain one of Wellhausen's surest titles to fame that, quite at the evening of his life and work, he

unreservedly acknowledged that he had not succeeded in solving this great problem of the exceptional religious character of the Israelites.[2] But many of his followers, without judgment, have ignored the obvious inference that, in this connection, there surely must be found a great error in Wellhausen's apparently simple calculation. And what the nature of this error is we have been able clearly to discern, at least, in part, by the new opening up of the ancient Orient, which opening up Wellhausen, as to its outward phenomena, had indeed seen, but which appeared never to have produced upon him any profound inner impression. His historic image was, in fact, practically completed before the stones of Babylon, Assyria, Palestine, and other lands, began to speak. He was never able to adapt himself to the more modern and scientific way of contemplating the ancient Orient with which we are now so familiar. And this situation we will try to sketch in a few brief and determined strokes in the following paragraphs. Our exposition will pursue a threefold direction.

1. The first fundamental error in the whole Wellhausen calculation is the so-called Bedouin religion, which is placed at the very outset of Israel's history. Whether there ever could have existed such a Bedouin religion as that which Wellhausen considers to be the point of Israel's beginning, is a question which shall not be discussed here. But it is an indisputable fact that the Hebrew tribes, among whom Moses arose, could not have had a Bedouin religion, for the very simple reason that they were not themselves Bedouins, but cattle raisers and semi-nomads.[3] This fact is proven not only by the traditions of Israel concerning the mode of life characteristic of the

[2] In his sketch of the Israelitish-Jewish history, in "Die Kultur der Gegenwart."

[3] The Achilles heel of the system has been well exposed by the Orientalist, H. Winckler, in his work, "Religionsgeschichtlicher und geschichtlicher Orient," 1906.

patriarchs, as well as of the tribal forbears in Egypt, but also by the famous clay tablets of Tel-el-Amarna. For, in connection with the picture of the cultural condition and the political organization of Palestine in the fifteenth to the thirteenth centuries B.C., which these tablets permit us to study, it is out of the question that the country, at that time, should have been a scene of Bedouin activities.

But more than this: These Hebrew fathers of Israel, which had themselves immigrated to Palestine as its forerunners, did not even come out of the desert, as is held by the Wellhausen hypothesis. On the contrary, they came out of the widely extended border territory lying between the land of culture and the desert; out of the *steppe*, which, again and again, has fed with population the Babylonian lowland in the east, and also, later, the land of the Arameans and Amorites in the west, as, finally, the country lying to the south of the Jordan, on both sides. Indeed, the recently discovered tablets of Bogharkoi, which, in several places, mention the Chabiri (the Hebrews of the Old Testament) as a section of the inhabitants of the empire of the Chatti (the Hittites), lead us to think, more and more, that we will have totally to abandon the conception, which Wellhausen takes for granted, and which long before prevailed, according to which the home of all Semites is to be sought in Arabia; but that, on the contrary, the Semites came from Asia Minor.[4]

But as to what the religion of those early wandering Hebrew stock farmers had been we are fully informed by the Bible and other writings which completely agree with it. Briefly told, this religion was the worship of the *Els*, which indeed occupied various terrestrial elevations, but whose cult was still something quite different from demonism and fetishism, or the worship of ancestors. These *Els*

[4]See Ungnad's "Die ältesten Volkerwanderungen Vorderasiens," 1915.

were, rather, divine beings with distinctive names and characteristics. Among them, for instance, was the El Berit of Shechem, who already was credited with moral functions; or, going still farther, El Shaddai, who exercised his power over various countries from his mountain in the land of the Amorites.[5]

Now, it may indeed be said that only the religion of Moses is here in question; and was not that religion established in the solitude of a desert, far removed from the lands of culture? Surely this fact cannot be altered by any number of new disclosures concerning the so-called "religion of the fathers." To this a fourfold reply can be given.

(a) If we indeed suppose that Moses was a historic personage—and this Wellhausen has always done—we can scarcely evade the conclusion, which is also confirmed by his Egyptian name, that he spent the early years of his life in Egypt. But even leaving out of the question the consideration of any direct religious influence that may have acted upon him from that source (what has been adduced in this direction, up to this time, is quite fantastic!), this much is absolutely certain—namely, that Moses must have known of divine beings who were supposed to possess power over widely extended countries and seas, over the heavens, the sun, and nature in general. Let us only think in this connection of the theological school at Heliopolis, in Egypt, and of its propaganda. With these alone in view, how can there be any serious consideration of the supposition that Moses should have preached to his countrymen a God whose sphere of activity did not extend beyond the confines of his own nation, even when he fulminated with thunder and lightnings and challenged with

[5]Compare with this the new work, "Die Bundeslade und die Anfange der Religion Israels" ("The Ark of the Covenant and the Beginning of the Religious History of Israel"), 1922.

earthquakes to prove the existence of this God? That surely is a thought not to be entertained![6]

(b) The work of Moses in the wilderness, first of all, crystallizes about two points—namely, about Sinai in the land of Midian, and about Kadesh to the northward. In regard to both, however, we should think of anything else than a land totally devoid of culture. To be sure, the location of Sinai is not known with certainty, even at the present day. Still it remains passing strange that in the legends of the Sinaitic peninsula, where Sinai was always sought, at Dschebel Serbal, at Dschebel Musa, at the Serabit, we discover very old Arabic-Egyptian sanctuaries, reaching back into the third millennium B.C. Or, if we should look for it at Vulcan, east of the Bay of Akaba, we increasingly gain the impression from ancient manuscripts that already, in the second millennium B.C., the land of Midian was a land of culture.

But be this as it may, in any case, the traditions of Israel presuppose that, before the time of Moses, there existed a Midianitish sanctuary, with its appropriate priesthood. And as regards Kadesh, the beautiful oasis, particularly rediscovered by Trumbull, called Ain Kadesh, investigations undertaken during the World War have shown that here, as early as the neolithic period, settlements have existed.[7] We have to consider this place of wonderful fertility also as an ancient sanctuary, dating from long pre-Mosaic times; and it is a thought well worth considering that Levites have been priests of the same. But this also is to be noted, that wherever in the ancient Orient there was a sanctuary with

[6]On the ground of this consideration Bäutsch in his admirable work, "Altorientalischer und Israelitischer Monotheismus" (1906), departed from the Wellhausen school.

[7]See "Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen des deutsch-turkischen Denkmalschutz-kommandos" (German Turkish Report), Sinai, by Th. Wiegand, Part I., 1923.

a priesthood, there coexisted religious traditions of earlier sanctuaries, together with calendarial, juridical, and mythical wisdom of some sort. There writing was done in an excellent manner, and there records were made; but there the stadium of Bedouin religion had become antiquated.

(c) In the third place, we must ask: What, among other things, was the object of Moses in sojourning in the wilderness? Is it not clear that he considered such a sojourn only as being a necessity, and to be ended as soon as possible; that it was his purpose to lead forward his tribes as quickly as might be to the Palestinian land of culture? But it would be altogether *naïve* to assert that Moses could not, then and there, in the wilderness have given the laws and regulations which related to a life to be lived later in the land of culture. On the contrary, his whole religious establishment must have been already arranged with a view to this future living. The commands which he gave must have had regard, in the very first place, to the perils which would beset the true religion from contact with the cultural customs of Canaan and its people. Hence the inhibition of images, the command concerning the Sabbath, and that against coveting a neighbor's house.

(d) In the fourth place, the principle which Wellhausen has deduced from the copious traditions recorded in the book of Exodus, "Jahwe, the God of Israel; Israel, the people of Jahwe," is found, upon closer examination, to be a sheer impossibility as the expositive of a Mosaic Bedouin religion. It is self-evident that the statement in question concerning Jahwe could have been made when the founder of the religion had in other ways created in his compatriots a vivid impression of his nature and will.

But that sentence alone, as no less an authority than Eduard Myer fifteen years ago said, and that with all

needed emphasis,[8] is an unmeaning phrase; and there has existed no ancient Oriental religion which could be built upon the foundation of a statement so abstract. And let us consider further. Wellhausen makes the Hebrew tribes to reach Sinai with a *tabula rasa*, as regards religion; and it is Moses who first sows the seeds of faith in his people's life. In reality, however, as we have already seen, we shall have to take it as settled that these tribes were long before possessed of strongly developed religious conceptions. They had known and worshiped other Els; now they needed only to be instructed in what the uniqueness of the nature and will of Jahwe consisted, as contradistinguished from those of all other gods. This could not, upon the whole, without further ceremony, be decided for the people; on the contrary, only through constant conflict with an existing religion could a new religion prevail and unfold itself. This new faith would have to discover the means of maintaining itself as the religion of a greater, wiser, mightier, and better God; otherwise, the hour of its birth had also been the hour of its death.

In short, Wellhausen places at the beginning of Mosaic religion something which, it is true, was an impulse in its establishment, but in its isolation, so far as our present knowledge of the record of Oriental religion goes, is simply a historical impossibility. This impossible something is the endeavor to construct in the history of the religion of Israel a scheme of development from its smallest beginnings to its highest point, from the egg to the butterfly, as it were. It is not possible to emphasize too strongly the fallacy of this as a method of historical construction.

2. But Wellhausen makes a still greater mistake in his conception of the religion of Canaan, which, doubtless, did most strongly influence the religion of Israel. Thus, while he was delineating the former, a true image of the latter

[8]See "Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstame" ("The Israelites and Their Neighbor Tribes"), 1906.

could not possibly result. Here, owing to the opening up of the ancient Orient, the issue has been placed, during the last few decades, upon much safer ground than before. But Wellhausen remained immovably standing upon ground which was scientifically approved only in about 1880. [A half century of belatement, avidly shared in to-day by American would-be critics.—*Editor.*]

A complete revulsion had been caused already by the discovery of the clay tablets of Tel-el-Amarna in Egypt (1888). This discovery proved, in the first place, with absolute certainty, what nobody had taken into consideration in connection with the Biblical accounts—namely, that Palestine had been, in the fourteenth century B.C. [*cir.* the century of Moses.—*Editor*], ruled over by Egyptian viceroys; but it added the still more surprising fact that these viceroys transmitted their reports to the Egyptian court in cuneiform characters. The scholastic followers of Wellhausen sought to meet the necessarily far-reaching deductions flowing from this fact by asserting that the use of this mode of writing in diplomatic correspondence was of little consequence; that no exaggerated inference should be drawn from it. A few Babylonian scribes in Palestine could not be considered as having influenced the intellectual life of the country.

But this subterfuge was soon made unavailable. Dr. Bliss, in his excavations at Lachish, Palestine, in the year 1892, discovered a clay tablet, inscribed in Babylonian characters, obviously a correspondence between native princes of the land, and not from a foreign land. In 1904, I had myself the good fortune, in my excavations at Taanach, to find an entire small archive of clay tablets, which incontestably proved that the great men of Canaan not only made use of no writing except the Babylonian in their correspondence, but also had all lists of supplies to be delivered to them drawn up in that language.

The conclusion cannot now be evaded that the writing of

Babylon thus early became the writing of Palestine in general. What this means can surely be seen from many analagous instances. With the writing of a strange people, there always flows in upon the life of the people adopting it a large influence of the intellectual life of the people from whom it is adopted. This was demonstrated *ad oculus*, for among the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna there was found, among others, the text of the Babylonian myth Adapa, which had evidently been sent to Egypt in order that Egyptian students might study from it the language and writing of Babylon. In the same way, the Babylonian myths and legends must have found their way into Palestine about the middle of the second millennium B.C., probably much earlier.[9]

But not these alone. The same will prove true with regard to the Babylonian songs, laws, etc. At the same time, and logically, the Babylonian pantheon, or at least the text of its theogony, became naturalized in Palestine. That this is not an airy inference, but that the question here turns upon facts of mathematical certainty, is proven to the fullest extent by the excavations in Palestine. In Taanak, I found a tile cylinder dating from the first half of the second millennium B.C., upon which the legend of Atanakili is written in Babylonian characters, and in which he designates himself as a servant of the Babylonian god Nergal. In Lezer, Macalister found one of these upon which the constellations of the Babylonian zodiac were engraved. A portion of the idols found, representing male and female deities, were obviously of Babylonian origin.

---

[9]I have called attention at some length in the initial number of this series, "The Crisis of Criticism," to these Babylonian "text-books" in Egypt, and there suggested the possibility that one of these, it may be the identical tablet of Adapa, was used by Moses while being taught as a youth in "all the wisdom of the Egyptians." I was not then aware that so great an authority as Professor Sellin had given particular attention to this matter.—*Editor.*

But this, indeed, was but one side of the newly gained knowledge. Exactly in the same manner, and partly to an extent much stronger, the decidedly Egyptian woof of culture was everywhere betrayed by the excavations of the Palestinian remains of the second millennium B.C. It may be said that almost the entire nature of amulets originated there. The Egyptian scarabs, the figures of Bes, etc., which we found were innumerable. Upon the tile cylinder mentioned above there was inscribed beside the Babylonian legend an Egyptian legend in which the carrier wished for himself a long life. It is not possible to indicate more clearly and absolutely where are to be found the two sources of the intellectual religious life of Palestine before the entrance into it of the people of Israel.[10]

We must, however, add a third factor. Everywhere in our excavations we have had to show how large an importation of ceramic wares is existent from the sphere of the Mediterranean, representing the so-called Ægean culture. Vases, plates, potsherds, and also jewelry, in many cases, actually corresponded with those found in Mycenæ, Crete, and elsewhere in the Mediterranean sphere. Up to this time, we have spoken in our publications only of Ægeic wares. The progressive deciphering of the clay tablets of Boghazkoi, however, teaches us how strong the political influence of the Hittites upon Palestine must have been in the second millennium B.C. And in future we shall have to examine with still closer scrutiny whether much of the results of that culture which we have till now unhesitatingly designated as Ægean may not have to be classed as Hittite. I am thinking in this connection of the glorious finds which Macalister made in Gezer and which, at first, he designated as Philistean.

[10]Support of this is found in my work, "Der Ertrag der Ausgrabungen im Orient fur die Erkentnis der Entwichlung der Religion Israels" ("The Contribution of Excavations in the Orient to the Knowledge of the Development of the History of Israel"), 1905.

In short, three powerful intellectual religious cultures of foreign countries doubtless strongly influenced Palestine during the second millennium B.C., a fact which no one ever could have taken into account upon the basis of Biblical records alone; and of which Wellhausen, in his entire sketch of the religious history of Israel, really never once took account.

Let us now get clearly before us these far-reaching consequences. For Wellhausen, the Canaanitic religion and culture were always the narrower Amoritic-Palestinian type, the worship of the gods of fertility, of fields, of springs and the trees, of the local Baals, with their female complements and the deities of Astarte, which the Bible shows to have strongly influenced and colored the life of Israel. But we now know that, beside these, the stellar gods played an equally great part. We also now know that the worship of these stellar gods had been introduced from without; that they were deities not confined to a single country, but whose sphere was the whole earth.

But now the Bible makes it very plain that, in spite of the violent destruction of certain cities of Canaan by Israel, in other districts than urban communities, the newly immigrated tribes lived for centuries side by side with the Canaanites; that the Israelites did not succeed in conquering many cities of Canaan, and that hence, for good or ill, they gradually entered into connubial and commercial relations, into spiritual and temporal intercourse, with them. See particularly Judges i. and ix. In consequence of this, there must have been exerted upon Israel a very strong religious and cultural influence by the culturally far superior Canaanites. And of the fatal fruits of this influence we plainly learn from the preëxilic prophets. According to these, Israel became completely Canaanized.

But what did this signify? Most assuredly, on the one side, it signified an immense retrogression. Gone was the

former chastity and purity of worship, and instead of these sexualism and alcoholism. Gone also were morality, spirituality, and the invisibility of Jahwe; he too had been converted into Baal, and was worshiped as an image of wood or stone. We can well realize the holy wrath of an Elijah, an Amos, and a Hosea at this appalling apostasy.

And yet, at the same time, let us not forget that the religious horizon had become an incomparably extended one, and that, therefore, the religion of the *One* must have prevailed in a much wider sphere than before and must have strengthened the faith of those who with real piety clung to the Jahwe of Moses. Nor, again, let us forget that the higher culture here, as elsewhere, could operate positively, growing fruitful with religion. But it was just this phase of development that Wellhausen completely overlooked, and, while insisting that Palestine be separated by a Chinese wall from the rest of the ancient world, has presented us with its completely delineated historical and cultural image.

Let us, for instance, take up in this connection the narratives of the primeval times of the creation, of the flood, and else. That these are, as regards the outward form of the narratives, intimately related to Babylonian myth literature—that is, treating of the same subjects—any child may readily see. But Wellhausen knows of no contact of Israel with the culture of Babylon before the eighth century B.C. and during the Babylonian exile. According to him, therefore, those Genesis narratives of Israel can have no earlier date than the eighth century B.C. This is, in reality, a shockingly wrong inference. All such stories had certainly passed from mouth to mouth as early as the second millennium B.C. At least among the priests of Canaan, and at every Canaanitic festival in which an Israelite took part, for instance, in Shechem, these stories must have been heard as early as one thou-

sand years before Christ. Sufficient opportunity to nave come to a religious understanding with them!

The same holds good in respect of the religious songs, the hymns, and the psalms of the Hebrews. It is known how striking, in many instances, is the relationship of the Babylonian songs to those of the Bible; and this without detriment to the difference in their deepest religious kernel. There surely must exist some genetic connection.

However, for Wellhausen, these parallels do not at all exist. He takes into account only the possibility of further intra-Israelitish development, and comes to a conclusion which knocks all tradition in the face—namely, that, on the whole, we do not possess in the Hebrew canon a psalm dating from preëxilic times. It is most gratifying to be able to state that, in opposition to this view, an unusually strong reaction has set in. While, about the beginning of the new century, it had become almost a dogma that the Psalter (of David) was a postexilic book—against which assumption Koenig, myself, and a few others protested in vain—a pronounced change of opinion has taken place during the last two decades. This we owe partly to Gunkel[11] and partly to the Norwegian, Mowinkel. In this connection it is also perfectly clear and certain that in every Canaanitish religious service hymns and songs were sung which would suggest to the Israelites the forms to be used in praising their God, and for confessing to him their sins.

Precisely the same picture is presented in connection with the book of Ecclesiastes. The land of its origin, from which it flowed into Palestine, was probably not Babylon, but Egypt, whereal ready, in the second millennium B.C., there were greatly celebrated writers of proverbs, and where the problem of human life was being poetically treated of. Also, let us not forget that Solomon, with whose court tradition connects the origin of the poems of

[11] "Selected Psalms," 1911; "Studies in the Psalms," 1921-22.

wisdom in Israel, had an Egyptian princess for his wife. In the opinion of Wellhausen, however, all the poetic wisdom of Israel is a postexilic product!

Now, I could adduce precisely the same thing in regard to eschatology and in regard to laws and related matters. Again and again, we meet in this sphere with the same phenomena in the history of the people dwelling round about Israel. For centuries, indeed for millenniums, may be traced close parallels of all these exhibits.[12] But Wellhausen ignores these facts, and since, as he views it, they could have been produced only centuries later, according to the laws of a development operating from within, from the germinal cell which he places at the beginning, he pushes everything that does not fit into his scheme into the time after the Babylonian exile, where we now find coexisting a complete chaos of contradictory literature.

But we are not inclined to treat here this literature taken separately. Only as to the kernel of religion, faith in God, we must explain more fully how false premises led to false conclusions. We have seen above what conception Wellhausen had of the God of Moses, as seen from Sinai. To Wellhausen, he was a popular God, and nothing more. Now, the more certainly the Israelites became settled in Canaan, the more certainly did Jahwe make it his home; it became his dwelling place, and he himself became the God of the country, a Baal, as Wellhausen saw it. This conception is sought to be bolstered up by some isolated passages, such as 1 Samuel xxvi. 19 f., etc. It is then supposed that the prophets of the Scriptures were the first who procured for Jahwe a relation to the whole world.

I say nothing here of the fact that those who speak of

[12]The extensive material which we possess in this connection is found in the works of Schrader, A. Jeremias, and Gressman, recently assembled by A. Firkn in "Altorientalischen Kommentar zum Alten Testament," 1923.

the world God quite obviously presume that they are speaking of something well known to everybody. But, as to that, I must point out that if Wellhausen had been seriously concerned as to what kind of gods the Canaanitic gods were, he could not have reached a so false conclusion. There certainly were among the Baalim of Canaan quite a number of minor local deities occupying particular precincts beyond which they had no power (as, for instance, Baal-zebub of Ekron, 2 Kings i. 2). But besides these, the Canaanites already knew a Baal of heaven, as they knew a Hadad, who rushed through the whole land in the storm winds.[13] Already, in the fourteenth century B.C., a Canaanitic prince introduces a letter to the king of Taanach with the form: "May the lord of the gods protect thy life!" It is a curious parallel to the El Eljon, "the most high God" of the Canaanite, Melchizedek, in Genesis xiv.

Thus, when we suppose, as Wellhausen once does, an influence coming to Israel from the Canaanites, we must conclude that, beside this matter, the Israelites had learned to know a God separate from all confines of nation and country. And we would also remind the reader of the fact that the Canaanites not only knew the Baal of heaven, but that they knew the Babylonian sun god, the creator of heaven and earth, whether they called him Bel or Shamash. They also knew the Egyptian Re Ammon and other deities. After this, is it to be supposed that the politically superior and victorious Israelites, say, in the time of David, were so *naïve* as to compare their Jahwe with the insignificant Baals of the country, and to relegate the rule of the world to the god of a people they had conquered?

In order not to be misunderstood, I should like to emphasize in this place the fact that, personally, I connect the thought that Jahwe was the world God directly and

[13] Particularly the essay by Gressman, "Hadad and Baal," in der Baudissinfestschrift, 1918.

immediately with the establishment of the Mosaic religion. It seems perfectly clear to my mind that, already, the earliest songs of Israel reflect this thought. Or is the God at whose approach from Sinai to Canaan the whole earth trembles, on whose behalf the very stars of heaven are found to be fighting, not a world God? (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Judges v. 4.)

My only purpose in this, apart from the wish to establish religion, is to show that Wellhausen, upon the ground of a religious conception of the Canaanites of the second millennium B.C., has reached quite a different conception of the God faith of the old Israelites from that which he has given us in his "History of Israel and the Jews."

The last and most serious mistake in the entire religio-historical scheme of Wellhausen, which quite gradually has come to the knowledge of science under the progressive opening up of the ancient Orient, may be stated as follows: Always and without reflection, Wellhausen conceives of the religion of Israel as a unit up to the time in which the prophets of Scripture arose. This is done without perceiving that then, as at all times, the most varied directions, strata, and currents must be supposed. We have already seen how he disposes of altogether contradictory literature in postexilic times. For instance, he takes for granted that side by side with the code of the priests which places the sacrifice of beasts in the very center of the Israelitish religion, psalms were composed which directly reject animal sacrifices, such as Psalms xl., l., and li. Up to the time of Amos, Wellhausen really allows of but two great things—namely, the religion of Canaan and the religion of Jahwe!

This methodical blunder necessarily is followed by serious consequences. All expressions of religious life in Israel before the times of the prophets, however depreciatory, he forthwith sets down as expositives and results of the old Israelitish—that is, the Mosaic—religion. And,

with preference, his eye rests on the expression of the lower order of piety, which doubtless occupied a large space in Israel, but which, in reality, had little to do with the religion of Moses.

Instead of this false uniforming of the old Israelitish religion, the right image of that religion, as we see it, partly on the ground of the excavations in the ancient Orient, partly through vivid representations from other ancient sources, is, briefly, as follows:

(a) We must differentiate between four classes of religion which in Israel have had concurrent courses, and of which now one and then the other predominated; and, in each case, we have to distinguish carefully with which class we are dealing.[14] First, there is the unadulterated religion of Canaan, which penetrated wide circles in ancient Israel. When an Israelite became an inhabitant of a Canaanitish town, and possibly also married a Canaanitish woman (*vide* Jerub Babel in Shechem), he in no wise shrank from confessing the Baal of the place. He also took part in the local sacrificial feasts without detriment in his own mind to the fact that, before all others, Jahwe was to him the real God, the God of war and of battles, the God of justice in whose presence he solemnly made his oaths.

As it was with the inhabitant of a town or city, so it was with the peasant. From centuries, the field which he cultivated had been considered as the domain of its respective Baal. All customs of tilling and harvesting were intimately connected with faith in him. No wonder the peasant sought to obtain the favor of such a deity, from whom, according to the ineradicable belief of the people, came the blessing of fertility. Hosea, in his second chapter, unfolds before us a vivid picture of the conception of the masses in this respect. The greater part of the worship is intimately connected with this Canaanitic agri-cult (field religion),

[14] "Moses und sein Bedeutung fur die israelitisch-judische Religiongeschichte," Sellin, 1922.

from which the Israelitish peasant did not deem it proper to withhold. Let us remember how among the German tribes, despite their stalwart Christianity, customs connected with the worship of Woden have maintained themselves through the centuries.

(b) The same can be said of the old El religion of the Hebrew fathers. Moses was not able to extirpate this, root and branch. And the people, having arrived in Canaan, came again to the ancient sanctuaries of their fathers, to Bethel, to Shechem, to Gilgal, to Beersheba, and elsewhere, with which this El religion in particular was intimately connected. Of course, these Israelites now considered Jahwe as that God who had once revealed himself there to the patriarchs; but the forms under which El had been formerly worshiped, the stone column, later, also, the image of the steer, were taken over, and again without detriment in their own minds to the fact that the contrast with the commandments of Moses was obvious. Here also a multitude of analogies from the history of the shortcomings of the Christian Church might be adduced. But still something else belongs to this province of the religion of the fathers. The religion of Jahwe was, first of all, a matter of the people, not of the class and, least of all, not of the house.

In these realms, however, the old manners and customs maintained themselves for centuries—the tribal feast, the family sacrifice, at which ancestors were remembered, and when the teraphim, the home deities, from whom were expected prosperity and the blessing of children, were invoked. All this, however, had nothing whatever to do with the religion of Jahwe. It persisted as the token of a past religious epoch.

3. Besides this, there was a third spiritual current which we will simply call the priest religion. Its promoters were principally the Levites, and it played its main part in the chief sanctuaries, and, later, at the courts of the kings.

We might, therefore, designate it as the official religion of the people. In full confidence, this faith firmly maintained that Jahwe was the one God of Israel, and must always remain so. It did not tolerate any cult of the Baalim; it declared war against the worship of ancestors, against the questioning of the dead, and against war; and, as in the days of Saul, it knew how to summon the power of the government against these evils (1 Sam. xxviii. 3). It proscribed all objects of cult which could not be made to agree with the worship of Jahwe; first of all, the Ashera, the symbol of the female goddess; and it must also have interdicted the teraphim, for they are made objects of ridicule in popular narratives. (See 1 Sam. xix. 13-17.)

For the rest, however, this priest religion made its peace with the culture of Canaan. The priests became aware that, on the whole, they must forfeit their support and their position if they set themselves to extirpate every remain of that which was derived from the culture of Canaan. They therefore took pains to give, as far as possible, a different interpretation to the stone column, the sacrifices, the image of the god, as also to the "house of gods." They uttered their oracles in the same manner as did the Levite of the peasant Micah (Judges xvii.), as the high priest Ahimelech did before Saul and David (1 Sam. xiv.), quietly by means of the ephod. These calculating priests are the creators of a unified worship of Jahwe, with a differently interwoven Canaanitish woof.

Yet another thing needs to be emphasized here. In consequence of the friendly attitude which the priest religion assumed to Canaanitish culture, it became the channel through which so much of the culture of Canaan as we have already considered found its way into the life of Israel. Myths, laws, hymns, and else now became radically transformed, and were made to agree with the spirit of the religion of Jahwe; that is to say, they were recreated

into something entirely new, which new thing betrayed the original only in certain parts and in its periphery.

(d) The last current, and doubtless the most important one for the history of religion, was that one which came of the testimony of those in Israel who would hear to no compromises, who clung to the divine words of the founder of their religion, who declared war against the whole culture and religion of Canaan, and who sought to maintain in its purity and integrity, even upon its new territory, the holy heritage of the past. The real backbone of this fellowship was the class which, even in Canaan, remained altogether true to the manner of life lived by the fathers. It was formed from the cattle raisers, the shepherds, and their representatives were the charismatics, the prophets, and Nazarites. As the latter condemned the drinking of wine, the drink of Baal, another and related sect, the Rechabites, considered the living in settled houses as a sin. They rejected images, "houses of gods," bloody offerings, and oracles. Instead, they demanded obedience, justice, and love; they recognized only the decalogue of Moses as the will of God. (See Amos v. 25 ff; Hosea vi. 6, etc.)

This entire tendency, which indeed we have learned about in the writings of the oldest of the prophets of Scripture, Amos and Hosea, did not have its beginning at this time. Rather it runs, like a scarlet thread, through all the preceding centuries of Israel's history. It is true that its representatives appear rather as meteors than stars in the ancient history. In the first place, they left no writings behind, for they did not belong to the class of dwellers in cities, but to the unlettered, with their places of abode in the villages, upon the pasture lands of the shepherds, and among the inhospitable mountains. But that every time they arise a full tide of the populace stands behind them is a demonstrable fact. How else could Elijah, one hundred years before Amos, have dared to announce to Ahab the divine judgment on account of the judicial

murder of Naboth, or cry out to the assembled people: "How long halt ye between two opinions?" His fight is directed against the priest religion, which sought to worship in Jahwe the god Baal; against those who, while they kissed the supposed image of Jahwe, bowed the knee before Baal. And in like manner, fully a century before, did the prophet Nathan, a preacher of the God of righteousness, who will not tolerate murder and adultery, even on the part of the king. Yet, at the same time, this man was a representative of that religion which declined to recognize festivals, shrines, and temples in general, but only the movable tent as the sanctuary of Jahwe, as formerly in the wilderness (2 Sam. vii. 1 ff.; the same thought at Hosea viii. 14). And, strange to say, the proud king thus rebuked who himself lived in a palace, up to the end of his life retained the simple tabernacle of worship. (1 Kings i. 39.)

Again, the prophet Samuel, a half century earlier than Nathan, standing before Saul, hurled into his face the words: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he also has rejected thee from being king."

Here, too, observe, the whole official cult, as set over against obedience to the simple word of God, is rejected. And, equally strange, as with David, the king bows before the ambassador of Jahwe. Finally, at the beginning of the history of Israel in Canaan, we learn of a prophetess, Deborah, who preached righteousness in the mountains of Ephraim (Judges iv. 5). This same woman is found at the head of the hosts which, in the plain of Megiddo, near Taanach, put to flight the mighty hosts of the Canaanites. And the glorious hymn which celebrates this victory, at the same time exalts Jehovah as the true Victor, the Lord

who came down from Sinai in storm and tempest to be a help to his people. This hymn knows nothing of priests and sacrifices. The divine inspiration of a woman has brought to the tribes the help of Jahwe.

I ask: Where now is to be sought the proper religion of ancient Israel? Is it not to be sought in this progressive chain of charismatic personalities, who know only the morally holy God, the God who is above all landmarks? Does not the kernel of the real old Israel, though it may have played no considerable part in politics, stand always behind them? Is it not simply a continuation of the work of Moses, as, in another view, the Scriptural prophets are only the spiritual pupils of men like Samuel, Nathan, and Elijah?

And now let us return to Wellhausen. The last current of religious life in Israel, upon which really all depends, he pushes back entirely, or, to say the least, he does not permit it in any way to appear in its true significance. Instead, he borrows the color of the old religion of Israel promiscuously from the first three currents in which a continuation of the work of Moses finds no expression at all, or only in imperfect infusion. Ought we, therefore, to be surprised that this whole portrait appears as a caricature of the Mosaic religion? Ought we to be surprised that it is made to appear that the prophets of Scripture have brought to us, after the centuries of the ancient nature religion are spent, something totally new—the ethical faith of Jahwe? It seems clear to me that just here is to be sought the chief error in Wellhausen's calculation.

Now, however, I should say quite frankly that frequently, indeed most frequently, the attacks formerly made against Wellhausen at this point have not been over-well considered. The man who, most of all in Germany, has risen as a tireless opponent of Wellhausen, Eduard Koenig, has always, and very properly, pointed out that in the argumentation of this matter a great error has been committed.

This error Koenig conceives to be that Wellhausen did not distingusih between the legitimate and the illegitimate religion of Israel. There is certainly truth in this, as we have seen; but the distinction does not suffice. For, when Wellhausen, in opposition to this, calls attention to acts or utterances of the chief priests Ahimelech and Abiathar, or of King David, we certainly are dealing with "legitimate" religion. And yet their acts do not agree with the Decalogue, the expressed intention of the founder of the religion of Israel. We need only to be reminded of the worship of images by Gideon, and others.

With perfect justice, therefore, Kittel, Volz, and others have insisted that in these instances we will have to distinguish more strictly between a religion of the people (I should prefer to call it either urban or peasant religion, respectively), a religion of priests (the religion of Jahwe passing current at the official sanctuaries), and a religion of prophets (first of all, a shepherd religion). I confess to being unable to understand why Koenig in recent publications has, time and again, sought to oppose such a division, for I rather believe that in doing this he has suffered himself to be robbed of his best weapon against the construction of Wellhausen.

But this thought we do not need to pursue further. At any rate, it is a simple fact that the four currents above described prevailed in the religious life of ancient Israel, and that, naturally, they had been united one with the other, but also again stood in strong opposition to each other. It is further a fact that only in the fourth of these currents, the religion of the prophets of Scripture, can we again recognize, in pure and unadulterated form, the continuation of the creation of Moses. In the opposite direction, we revert from this current to the great achievement of Sinai.

Now, in conclusion, let us ask: What have the excavations in Palestine to do with this our view of the religious

history of ancient Israel, as over against that of Wellhausen? We may properly say that, in so far as we are able to adduce from these excavations results looking in this direction, the same completely agree with our conceptions. We must, however, premise that, up to this time, practically only cities have been excavated. On an average, these cities were Canaanitish for two thousand years, and afterwards only for a few centuries belonged to Israel; and then, with a population which, as to blood, was predominantly Canaanitic, as a matter of course, they could present but a feeble image of the religious history of Israel. Concerning nearly all the cities excavated up to date, Lachish, Gezer, Beth-shemesh, Taanach, Megiddo, Jericho, Jerusalem, there can be no doubt that most of them were not founded by the Israelites, but, on the contrary, had a long pre-Israelitish history, as we learn from Judges i., etc. Up to this time, the only originally Israelitic town which has been exposed is the town of Sebaste (Samaria). That was excavated by Americans, and concerning that, we regret to say, the report has not reached us.

And yet we are able to derive from the work done in these cities, which were Israelitish, say, from 1,000 to 700–600 B.C., a certain religio-historical result—namely, that in the various single cities, even in the time of Israel, there existed very different religious altitudes. We must, therefore, guard against the tendency to reduce to a common level everything that pertains to the Israel of former times.

I select one particularly drastic illustration. Innumerable small idols of goddesses, made of clay or bronze, were found in Gezer, Taanach, and Megiddo, belonging even to the so-called Israelitish era. We hereby obtain the impression that the gradual advance of the cultural element, as a rule, did not bring about any change; that women, in the act of parturition, were wont to embrace persistently these diminutive amulets. This view is rudely antagonized

by the fact that, in the part of Jericho inhabited by Israelites, the excavation of which was carried out by myself, only a single idol of this class, and that of Egyptian origin, was found.

It is seen that the question at Jericho is concerning an essentially different sphere of culture. Here, in the lowlands of Jordan, far removed from the great international caravan routes, the specifically religious qualities of Israel found quite a different mode of expression. We shall commit an egregious blunder if, without more ado, we estimate these qualities on the grounds of the finds at Gezer and elsewhere in its region.

As for the rest, it must be said that a certain influence, perhaps only a negative influence, of the new religious factor can indeed be observed almost everywhere. We find traces of it in the ceramic art, where the former joy in pictorial representations has faded away, and where we now meet with pitchers and bowls with only shabby ornamentations. It is also noticeable in the cessation of child and building sacrifices. Instead of the human bodies formerly immured in the foundations, deposits of plates, pitchers, and lamps are substituted. In one instance—in Gezer—the contents are small human figures made of silver, a sure sign that here a relief from former sanguinary sacrifices obtained. And nearly always we notice here that an invisible factor begins to operate, now stronger, now feebler; a factor which we cannot get hold of by means of pick, ax, or spade, but which, nevertheless, is present—faith in an invisible, spiritual God who desires not human sacrifice.

The handles of pitchers, dating from the fifth century B.C., which I found in Jericho, which bore the name of Jahwe engraved upon them, and which could be recognized by this as vessels used by a holy people, set the seal of certainty upon the find. (Zech. xiv. 20.)

I scarcely think that the excavations in Palestine will

ever yield us any surprisingly new disclosures concerning the actual higher spiritual religion of Israel, however many illustrations of the lower classes they may have furnished, for the certain location of the pure and undefiled religion of Moses was in the pastures and on the mountain slopes, beyond the confines of the cities, where we are not likely to dig. But, in closing, we must again emphasize the fact that all the results obtained up to the present tally in the most perfect manner with our conception of the religious history of Israel. They also bear direct testimony against the view that the religion of this people, up to the eighth century B.C., was still simply a religion of nature, not unlike that of neighboring nations, as the Moabites, the Phœnicians, and others.

Without regarding details more than was strictly necessary, we have tried in the above to examine the strength of the religio-historical structure of Wellhausen. At each stage we have had to hold that modern researches in the ancient Orient conclusively show that, instead of Wellhausen's construction, an entirely new construction must be demanded; that the former does not correspond to what has been proven during the last three of four decades as presumptive of all Oriental religious history. This we have substantiated by an argument carried over a threefold direction. By this, however, we do not mean to say that other essential errors of Wellhausen might not be pointed out.

If we have, now and then, made use of expressions somewhat severe, these, of course, are not used in personal reference to the highly gifted and eminent scholar, who for some years has no longer been with us, but from whom constantly we have been learning. Those expressions are rather used in connection with those parrot-like repeaters and blind adherents of Wellhausen's system, who, sad to say, are among us still. These have sometimes plainly to be reminded that this system has had its day, and that it

really no longer stands upon the high plane of modern science.

That the severe criticism of the Old Testament writings indulged in by Wellhausen has matured permanent results is so self-evident to me that I shall waste no words upon it.[15] But into the general history of religion he has introduced a knowledge of facts which is not likely to pass away. In this connection, I am thinking chiefly of what he has contributed toward the history of the origin of Judaism. But this shall not deter me from maintaining with all possible emphasis that we must lay an entirely different foundation of the history of the Jewish religion from that which he has laid, if we desire to get nearer to the historic truth.

I would here leave no room for doubt that, according to my opinion, this foundation of the history of Jewish religion can be a lasting one only if it give indubitable expression to the fact that this religion, even from the hour of its birth, and without detriment to everything to be predicated of ancient religion and historical development, was still in its quality different from other religions, inclosing a germ which enabled it, in its own time, to become *the* religion of the world. But this again can be thought possible only if at its beginning there stands the unique experience of a mighty prophetic personality, who, as later tradition lispingly tells, saw God face to face, and had spoken to him by word of mouth, as may here be ventured.

I should not like to close this dissertation without having uttered this conviction: If I rightly understand our time, and especially the modern science of the Old Testament, the era of Wellhausen, in spite of all that we have learned

[15] My own attitude toward the literary-critical scheme of Wellhausen I stated in my "Einleitung in das Alte Testament," 1920, and have more strongly set forth in my polemic against the Wellhausen school, "Zur Einleiting in das Alte Testament," 1912.

of him, may be considered, with us in Germany, as antiquated and wholly of the past. This I deem to be proven by the generation of scholars growing up among us, who, in respect both of science and religion, are thinking from categories quite different from those of the time of Wellhausen.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 7

Away from Wellhausen

By
MARTIN KEGEL, Lic.Thl., Ph.D.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1924

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 7.—"Away from Wellhausen," by Martin Kegel, Lic.Thl., Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 8.—"The Five Books of Moses and the Question of Their Origin," by Max Loehr, D.Th., Ph.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Koenigsberg, Prussia. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 9.—"The Law and the Prophets," by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER SEVEN.

Away from Wellhausen.

BY MARTIN KEGEL, LIC.THL., PH.D.

With Introduction by the Editor

VII.

INTRODUCTION.

It is an instructive fact that most of the recorded heresies which vexed and distracted the theology and faith of the early ages of the Christian Church were known by the names of the men who chiefly promoted them. Sabellianism, Apollinarianism, Arianism, and Pelagianism are samples. It goes forever to the record that the greatest diversion of modern criticism against the traditional truth of the Old Testament must be known by the name of the man who was its chief sponsor. Julius Wellhausen, so recently departed from the walks of men, was the incarnation of the thought and leadership of that school of Biblical pragmatism which for the past half century, and more, through its attitude toward the Old Testament, has steadily annealed upon itself the descriptive and title of "higher criticism." The definition which, in view of its methods and results, the world in general has been forced to give to the higher criticism, so called, has been treated of in an earlier number of this series. Incongruous as the definition may make the case to appear, the higher criticism can no longer escape the charge of being synonymous with destructivism.

"Away from Wellhausen!" therefore, means a march backward from the camps of critical misadventure and false philosophical obsession, and a return to find a new and safer road of Bible interpretation. In a way fascinating, incisive, and illuminating Dr. Kegel has in this brochure traversed the obsessions of the Wellhausen scholastics, and pointed out the need of a new and safer way of going.

Taking as his starting point the attitude and teachings

of Friedrich Delitzsch, who has pushed the higher criticism to its most dangerous and destructive conclusions, Dr. Kegel effectively illustrates in his arguments the logic of his own former *jeu d'esprit:* "Wellhausen begat Delitzsch, and Delitzsch became the gravedigger of the method inaugurated by Hegel for handling the history of Israel." In a series of brilliant test inquiries, he shows the fallacy, the emptiness, and the pragmatism of the Wellhausen hypotheses. The reader will observe that these inquiries are pushed under the following heads:

1. The Philosophical Foundation of the Wellhausen Construction of the History of Israel.

As we have already seen, the Wellhausen hypothesis of the non-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, the law and the worship of the Jews, and the substituted idea of a non-miraculous and natural selection evolution of the history and religion of the Old Testament, had their roots in the *a priori* philosophy of Hegel, which was a form of intellectual evolution older than the physical monism of Darwin and Haeckel. According to this philosophy, there could be no revealed religion such as the Old Testament shows to have come to the Jews through Moses. Taking as a foundation this philosophy, which was commended to him chiefly through the example of Wilhelm Vatke, Wellhausen interpreted the whole body of Israelitish literature, law, and worship on a generally natural basis.

According to this principle, at or about the age of Abraham, idolatry developed through natural processes into semi-monotheism; with Moses, this semi-monotheism, on the basis of the Bedouin religion, became an agricultural cult, as the people entered Canaan; later, with the prophets, it became an ethical religion; and, still later, a legal religion, just before and after the Babylonian exile, when monotheism became the settled result of the evolution. The reader's interest will not fail to follow Dr. Kegel

through his review of these aspects of the philosophical side of the Wellhausen hypothesis.

2. The Method Which Wellhausen Employs to Bring the Sources into Harmony with His Philosophical Principle.

Having started out with the assumption that the religion and law of Israel were not a theocratic revelation, but a natural development, a necessitated growth, as the plants of the earth, Wellhausen found the Old Testament, as we have it through tradition, strangely at variance with his philosophical position. To preserve his theory, he must needs proceed to discount, deny, and change the records of Scripture as they are found written. This task of discrediting and discounting the Scriptures is the sum of Wellhausenism; it is the sum of the higher criticism, so called.

The reader will see with what fine scorn, yet with what dignified reasoning, our author traverses and characterizes these methods of destructivism. The work is in the style of a master of university polemics, and yet we rest confidently in the belief that all who read, without reference to degrees of personal attainment, will attend the argument with enthusiastic interest to the end.

3. Departure from Wellhuasen in Our Day—On New Path toward New Goal.

In this section Dr. Kegel fully anticipates the already certain general break with Wellhausen and his school. Had this brochure been written within the last three months, the author could have spoken with even more confidence than he has the call which is steadily becoming the watchword of the religious and theological fellowships of Germany and of the world—"Away from Wellhausen!"

The original text of this brochure, which has been published within the year in Germany, and in the translation of which the Editor has found most genuine pleasure, and,

at the same time, met a testing task, contains a fourth section—"Wellhausen's service to Old Testament science."[1] Our space does not admit of the publication of this section in full; but it is due Dr. Kegel that full representation of the sentiment of this tribute be made. The following extracts will suffice. Dr. Kegel says:

> When hitherto we have taken position against the philosophical hypothesis with which Wellhausen has come to the Old Testament literature, and against the methods he has employed in bringing the sources into agreement with his philosophical dicta, naturally in our statements we have not denied an actual service of Wellhausen to Old Testament science. As Johann Theiss, in his already quoted words, has not disallowed this service, so have Bible scholars of all tendencies willingly, and down to the present time, if, naturally, from different viewpoints, acknowledged the same.

Dr. Kegel sums up under four heads the particular service which he conceives Wellhausen to have rendered to Bible science in his day: (1) Wellhausen dealt with and brought to discussion the many difficulties which burden the view of the course of the traditional history of Israel; particularly, so far as the Israelitish religion itself comes into consideration. (2) Wellhausen made a new assembling of the course of Israelitish history, and particularly of the course of Israelitish religious history. (3) Wellhausen held that even his view of the course of Israelitish history, and particularly the course of Israel's religious history, was not the word of ultimate wisdom on the subject. (4) In many particular matters of criticism, Wellhausen's views were taken with absolute correctness.

The facts, however, of the Wellhausen adventure stand. A great intellect, a scholar and a leader of scholars, he was the victim of his own obsessions. An *ignis fatuus* of deductivism led him not only with rude and relentless

---

[1]The Editor gratefully acknowledges the service of the Rev. C. A. Lehmberg, of the Texas Conference, in rendering the second section of this brochure.

tread across the written and traditional testimony of revelation, but also drew him into the quagmires and quicksands of a specious speculation to which his memory is to be left with those of the heresiarchs of old. The monistic evolutionists of the nineteenth century, despite their materialistic creed, put the world of science under a debt of obligation because of their discoveries and adaptations in the fields of research; but a period of less than the life of two generations has seen their main tenet discounted and deserted by the world of scientific thought. Critical pragmatism and rationalistic evolution belong in the same category. The universe is a spiritual plenum. God has made his own place in his universe. Denying him this place, men cannot think rightly either of God or themselves.

AWAY FROM WELLHAUSEN.

It frequently happens in the history of humanity that strained relations grow up between neighboring peoples. Often it is not possible to say just where and when such strained relations begin to be noticeable. Gradually they become pronounced. On both sides is felt the approach of the heavy issue; but the fewest of mortals have the courage to look a coming catastrophe squarely in the eye. An oppressive sultriness settles on the general mind. Suddenly comes an act which, lightning-like, illuminates the whole situation. To the most unoffending soul it is made distinctly clear that the hour of the decisive conflict has struck.

It is thus in science. An assumption which perhaps throughout a decade, or even a century, has been accepted as unassailably proved is called in question. In the beginning the controversy is pushed continuously; then, at last, appears a pronouncement which strikes as with the blow of a trip hammer. Opinions crash one upon the other; and not till after the hardest battle do the combatants return to a state of rest.

As it was in the domain of New Testament science when, after divers differing attacks made against the traditonal view of the person of Jesus, David Friedrich Strauss, in the year 1835, published his "Life of Jesus"; so has it happened in our day in the realm of Old Testament science, through the writing of Friedrich Delitzsch, "The Great Deception," that result of which in the last decade or two has been to lead many to thoughts which sadly depreciate the Old Testament.

The question which most affects the significance of the Old Testament for us Christians is the one against which Delitzsch has particularly directed his onslaughts: Does

the collection of Old Testament writings which we possess in our canon merit the confidence which hitherto almost universally has been accorded it; or is it otherwise? Is the God of the Old Testament separated in character and fact from the God of the New Testament? Have we in the Old Testament Scriptures to do only with a purely human religious and ethically related literary output? At present, the contention centers on this issue.

It is not my purpose to multiply to a new total the refutations of Delitzsch's views. What was necessary to be said from the appellant side of the controversy concerning the present and future value of the Old Testament to Christianity has been spoken by Koenig, Seeburg, Sellin, Procksch, and others. I purpose to move in a somewhat different direction. I shall seek to show that Old Testament science during the past decade has not been wholly without blame in this—namely, that such unjustifiable attacks on the Old Testament as those made by Delitzsch should possibly have found tolerance.

The Old Testament science of the last few decades has stood wholly in the mandate of one man, the great Göttingen scholar, Julius Wellhausen, known to the widest circles through his "Introduction to the History of Israel" (Prolegomena zur Geschischte Israels). This book may be designated as the responsible source of the output of Old Testament science during the last four decades.

Wellhausen started out to change the view which earlier prevailed in belief concerning the historical sum total of the record of Israel; and this he has done—*changed* it!

I now affirm, and will seek to produce the proof therefor, that in his book, the "Prolegomena," the question of the value of the Old Testament for Christians in all essential matters is always and everywhere negatively answered; that Julius Wellhausen is to be regarded as the forerunner of Delitzsch, and that in the war against

Delitzsch our watchword, once for all, must be, "*Away from Wellhausen!*"

Even when the "Prolegomena" defies the Old Testament, almost all theologians of the day who follow its lead continue to protest esteem for the Scriptures, thus displaying no small amount of inconsistency; yet this esteem by not a few is placed only upon particular parts of the canon.

But is it really proper to charge directly and particularly upon Wellhausen responsibility for the views of Delitzsch? A varying contention concerning this has been maintained. In his "Theology of the Present," Sellin says: "I desire to use the opportunity here offered to notice that Delitzsch, in a measure, is to be absolved from the charge that he has built on the ground of the Wellhausen theory. Whoever knows Wellhausen knows that he has criticized his disciple (Delitzsch). They appear to me to be fully separated from each other." And in his "The Old Testament and the Evangelical Church of the Present," Forscher, in a review of Delitzsch, says: "So writes a German professor, the contemporary of Wellhausen," which is to say that he received directly from Wellhausen his understanding of the historical development of the Bible.

Concerning the above-quoted words of Sellin, the following is to be said in reply: First of all, it is beyond controversy that Delitzsch has used the whole order of Wellhausen's thought, as he himself expressly indicates in the introduction to his first bellicose writing. According to Delitzsch, Wellhausen has "uncovered and disentangled the skein of truth-contradicting claims and unscrupulous displacement of every kind presented in the Old Testament writings." Delitzsch knows, and he must finally allow, from whom he received the incitation to his attacks on the truth and validity of the Old Testament. Thus the essential cohesion between Delitzsch and Wellhausen is

revealed, a fact which has already been pointed out by evangelical and Roman Catholic writers, though not always in the most emphatic way.

In an essay on the "The Present State of Old Testament Theology and the Means for Its Improvement," Eduard Koenig writes: "It is not taking the situation unawares to say that, in the attempt made in his writing, 'The Great Deception,' to twist religious history out of shape, and in which he expressly calls himself a follower of Wellhausen, Delitzsch is found to be Wellhausen's latest valet." And again: "It is but a natural consequence that, finally, this should lead to the end of making Old Testament religion the offspring of diabolical deception." Johann Theiss, the Roman Catholic scholar, in his brochure on "Friedrich Delitzsch and His 'Great Deception'" (1921), distinctly and clearly affirms that "with Julius Wellhausen stands or falls the prophet of 'The Great Deception.'"

Delitzsch's method is finally seen to be quite the same as that which for one hundred years prevailed with the critical party of David Friedrich Strauss. Although it was held to be sun-clear that Strauss came from the side of the theological left, the representatives of that left attempted to make the theological right responsible for his methods. The statements to follow will show that in his skill in withholding from and degrading the Old Testament Delitzsch has in Wellhausen a not ineffective forerunner. Eduard Koenig, Johann Theiss, and myself in "The History of the Israelitish Priesthood," have, as I believe, with fullest correctness, shown the coherence which exists between these two before-mentioned critics.

Though a wider objection might be urged against those matters which are brought into view in the following observations, we will with only a brief word or two proceed. But perhaps some will say: "Is it really the proper time to bring the 'Prolegomena' of Wellhausen into feudistic question?" In the first place, it is urged that

Wellhausen for a full year has been no longer numbered with the living; secondly, that in the latter time of his life he scarcely so much as made allusion to Old Testament science; and, thirdly, that the discoveries in archæology during the last ten years, and the present activity of the so-called religious history schools of research have not generally fallen in Wellhausen's field of thought.

However considered, such objections are invalid! It is not a war against the sails of a windmill when the task is undertaken of combating the teaching of the Wellhausen of ten years ago. If indeed Wellhausen no longer sojourns among the living; if indeed in his last days he no longer dealt in his former rôle with Old Testament questions, it is still true that his influence with very many Old Testament students, both in Germany and in other lands, is immeasurably great. And what though with archæological discoveries, and the new problem-placing of the æsthetic folklore school, Wellhausen's construction of the history of Israel has been proven a failure, not overmany scholars have thereby been induced to break entirely with Wellhausen's scheme of Israelitish history. Moreover, the representatives of a more conservative judgment inside the Old Testament science are themselves severally in a stark maze from the overhanging of Wellhausen's central idea, so that they see not how to clear a new space for action.[1]

Wellhausen once used a highly ill-flavored illustration when he discussed the alleged retouching of the old tradition in the Israelitish history books. He declared the en-

[1]Dr. Kegel here states a most remarkable fact. In the face of discomfiture men hold to dishonored theories. Also, as Dr. Kegel has elsewhere said, men have been simply stupefied through the adumbrations of Wellhausenism. Doubly true has this been in America, where not a few with the apparent thought of acquiring intellectual caste have entered with but pitiable critical furnishing into the camp of the pragmatists.—*The Editor.*

tire old tradition to be overspread "as with a Judaic digestion mucus." ("Prolegomena," page 274.) One could affirm somewhat the same concerning Wellhausen's own performance. It can, in fact, be shown that he has so daubed over the history of Israel with a coloring of his own mixing that the original beneath can now scarcely be recognized; and numberless scholars and laymen no more have that original before them without the necessity of contemplating the garnishments of Wellhausenism.[2]

The consequence of this is that it becomes believable that a man like Delitzsch can toss that original to the heaps of ancient rubbish. The explanation of the sin of theological science during the past decade is really that it is chargeable to our own account, if also only indirectly. Now that we are conscious of this sin, we are in a position to carry forward successfully the offensive and defensive against Delitzsch and kindred spirits.

For the next, we will look at those philosophical principles from which Wellhausen most directly derived his scheme of the history of Israel.

I

The Philosophical Foundation of Wellhausen's Construction of the History of Israel.

In my already mentioned "History of the Israelitish Priesthood" appears the sentence: "Hegel begat Vatke; Vatke begat Wellhausen; Wellhausen begat Delitzsch; but Delitzsch became the gravedigger of the method inaugurated of Hegel for handling the history of Israel." That Wellhausen in a most pronounced measure depends on Vatke is known to every one familiar with the literature

[2]That which the layman interested in Old Testament science must needs take second hand, he can fully find to-day in the proscription of Wellhausen's doctrine. I recommend as being useful the "History of the Israelitish People for Schools and the Home," by Joachim Kurd, as also other popularized essays.—*Dr. Kegel.*

of Old Testament science, and is also clearly admitted by Wellhausen himself, who confesses that he had learned "the most and the best" from Vatke. How radically Vatke walked in his younger days in the way of Hegel is likewise generally known.[3] Eduard Koenig, in an article already referred to, has briefly called attention to the line running from Hegel through Vatke to Wellhausen. He then institutes the following inquiry: "Wherein originated the attempt to overthrow the Old Testament religious history?" The answer is thus given: "That came about, in the first place, through the ascendency of a philosophical postulate—that is, through the philosophy of Hegel." If one would understand the animosity of Wellhausen (and equally that of Delitzsch) against the essential contents of the Old Testament, and would grasp "the historical view of the records of Israel," as we have it from Wellhausen and his partisans, one must have Hegel's treatment of the Old Testament continually before his eyes. Naturally, it must not from this be inferred that Wellhausen has sketched his picture of the course of Israelitish history wholly from the viewpoint of the Hegelian *a priori* theory. That is with him as little the case as it is with Vatke. However, the Hegelian theory forces the statements of both very close to its own ground, as, for example, in the case of Vatke's execution of his "History of Old Testament Religion." If Wellhausen, on the contrary, has opportunely guarded himself, as he has in the logic of fixing the place of historical investigation, so he has, on occasion, deceived himself to no small extent.

According to Hegel, the Jewish religion had not only little advantage over the religion of heathenism, but stood somewhat the same in more than one relation. To him it follows that in the development of religion the spiritual

[3]See "Wilhelm Vatke and the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis," by Kegel.

individuality, or free subjectivity, passed through three stages—namely, "the Jewish religion of sublimity (the unity); the Greek religion of beauty (necessity); the Roman religion of utility (the understanding). Over against the Jewish religion of servant-like obedience, which caused to be known the might of the one God and the nothingness out of which, through his will, nature was shaped in wonder; and over against the prosaic earnestness of the Roman religion in which in Jupiter and Fortuna, the world lordship of the Roman people only received worship, was honored the warmer art religion of the Hellenes in the beautiful divine forms of that might of which men were in themselves aware—wisdom, courage, and beauty."

That the sympathy of Hegel was more on the side of the Greek religion than on that of the Jewish religion is now clear without further ado. The champion of the evolution principle must, of course, give little pledge to the transcendent divine presentation of the claims of the Israelitish people. Of a world creation this pantheist (panlogist) knows conceivably as little as he does of the invasion of the laws of nature and of human affairs by a personal God. All in the sense of Hegel, have Vatke and his pupil, Wellhausen, viewed and judged the Israelitish religion; and, indeed, beyond the sense of Hegel they have construed a development of this religion. Wellhausen himself once said that sympathy (and, we can quite naturally add, antipathy) easily leads to an invention of data. The Israelitish religion history was unconsciously accepted by both men as a compelling example of the correctness of the Hegelian philosophy of history and religion.

From here on, Wellhausen's whole manner of view in the "Prolegomena" stands on a natural basis. With Hegel, he holds "that all history is derived from a continuous vicissitude of opposition; and that only in the whole history course, and not in a part thereof, can come completeness of aspect." For the most part, he is measurably

enthusiastic—for his own religion is but an enthusiasm for the principle of pure rationalism—concerning the oldest times of Israel, in which, as Hegel has somewhere said, that principle in its purity is still demonstrable. But generally he detests that monotheism and supernaturalism of the later times, in which again, according to Hegel, that oldest Old Testament principle faces its exhaustion, and in which, more and more, its originality suffers loss.

Wellhausen is himself well aware that his construction of the history of Israel is more a product of his own world doctrine than of an exact historical inquiry. He has himself, on occasion, explained "the hypothesis" to be to him almost as important as the phenomenon itself. And he has emphasized that the instant literary criticism did not come on in opposition to the more realistic ground of the hypothesis of Graf.

The Wellhausen view of the course of the history of the religion of Israel is expressed in one sentence, of which we will come to speak in another later connection. The order of this view is as follows: The development goes from the nomad religion, through the agricultural religion, to the religion of the prophets and ends with the legal religion.

Of the religion of the patriarchs, which, according to Eduard Koenig, must still be appraised as the first step in Biblical religion—and which the united Biblical witnesses know in this order—Wellhausen knows nothing! According to him the patriarchal records hold only sagas of a later time, out of which concerning Israel's early ages we receive as good as nothing. Before the time of David, the account concerning Jacob and Esau had not even taken shape in outline. Abraham can be, upon the whole, but an open-air creation or involuntary invention.

According to Wellhausen, the history of Israel began to be made only as its tribes journeyed out of Egypt. At that time Israel was a race of primitive people, and the proof is particular and positive of the extent to which it

borrowed from the old Arabic heathenism. But from this view it is scarcely at any time to be explained how this so primitive people should have come out of the highly cultured land of Egypt! Its "primitive spiritual organization," which Wellhausen postulates, is a character of legislation in the existence of which it is not easy to believe. It is also a strange thought "that God or Moses suddenly should have discovered or introduced the settled ritual of the sacrifice" ("Prolegomena," page 55). It was a harsh centralization which for that time is not imaginable. So he reasons, and also assumes to prove, that Israel primitively could not possibly have had any written or fixed rules of worship or life. From the beginning of Israel, we have in the Old Testament "many unadulterated fragments of heathen myths" ("Prolegomena," page 310). "The decoloring of the myths is synonymous with *Hebrewizing*" (page 315). "In the old times the saga is the green tree, to use a figure, which, as it can and will, grows out of the earth; afterwards, is the dry wood, which, to circle and square, is hewn to exact dimensions." "In Hebrew antiquity divine worship was a natural disposition; indeed, it was as the blood of its life, to clarify which was the soul of its thought."

In Moses (to continue this critical adventure) the original Hebrew nomads found a reformer. Yet, to speak freely according to Wellhausen, the picture which tradition has sketched of Moses arises in nowise out of fact. Of couse, it would be a contradiction of the evolution principle to permit the tallest to stand at the beginning of the "unfolding." If we listen to Wellhausen, we know of Moses but little, and that continually. Certainly he is not the author of a great existing law code, even if he imparted an oral tora. He was in the first line of the prophets. He is sometimes allowed to be the originator of the Mosaic constitution in the same sense in which Peter is named as the founder of the Roman Catholic

hierarchy. The conclusion of the covenant on Sinai is naturally met by the rationalist Wellhausen with an opposition of most pronounced skepticism. It cannot be, since, above all, it implies the supernatural interference of God in the course of world history. Therefore the whole event is to him unthinkable.

Wellhausen's decretal is that the Mosaic legislation belongs to a time much later than that of Sinai! "It drew the poetic necessity, the constitutionalizing disposition of the people of Jehovah, toward a dramatic act on an elevated stage of culmination" (page 343).

After the death of Moses occurred the invasion of Canaan by the Israelites. That the time of the forcible entrance of the tribes into Canaan was a time of spiritual death naturally does not harmonize with Wellhausen's plan of the history of Israel. That plan, as he himself says, "goes uphill toward the times of the kingdom, and not downhill toward the time of Moses and Joshua." Out of the God of the Bedouin was always, more and more, the husbandry God of the agricultural religion. The people began gradually to give themselves a political constitution. After that beginning (Wellhausen supposes, from Judges v. 17) everything was in complete flux. The people with self-responsibility referred their spiritual problems to a future opportunity; "because these old Israelites must think rather on the building of houses in which to dwell than on the beginning of a church."

Wellhausen follows the first beginning of political authority in Israel with steady and peculiar fascination; also in this connection he shows himself to be a true Hegelian. Samuel, in connection with fortress-building for his people, has acquired with Wellhausen particularly great merit. "Originally Samuel was simply a seer, although equally a patriotic Israelite, to whose heart the needs of his people appealed; and in using his authority as seer to establish a man in whom he had in mind as fit, he became distinctly

the leader and helper of Israel." The bringing in of the kingdom, described by Wellhausen, is—one might almost say—the high point in the development of the history of Israel! On it rested the wider order, while on its ground the other institutions of the state advanced.

Wherever there is found in the sources which relate to the older times of the kingdom an opinion unfavorable to that kingdom, it is almost certainly laid by Wellhausen to the account of a "later interpolator," which explanation is to him "as clear as daylight." But the more powerless the kingdom became, the more rose that spirituality which earlier in Israel played an unimportant part, until finally the ecclesiastical concerns fully triumphed over those of the spiritual. That Wellhausen reasoning from such a hypothesis of Israelitish prophecy should not possibly have been even approximately correct is no wonder. It appears many times nearly as a retrogression compared with the early springing, the almost heathenish character of the beginning; so, for instance, Wellhausen says once of the source E that it is already under a stronger prophetic influence than J.

But it is to be noted that the prophets have attacked as error that "lively" *kultus* of the beginning time which is so highly appraised of Wellhausen. Yet he always opportunely argues from the grandiose figure of Elijah to prove that the principle of development inhered in the prophecy of the northern kingdom. But with the established ruling order the prophets had, in any case, nothing to do!

The first important step in the way of hierarchy is taken at the time of Josiah. This prince was, so Wellhausen assumes, one of a circle which initiated the book of Deuteronomy, which had shortly before been fabricated out of hand. According to Wellhausen, this law book makes no claim of an actually existing religious concentration in early Israel, and thereby leaves it demonstrable

that the religious life of the early times was paralyzed. It came, therefore, at once to a distinction between religion and life! Wholly in the spirit of Hegel's attempts at proof, Wellhausen says: "As the covenant book, and generally the whole previous Jahvistic literature, reflect the pre-prophetic period, so is Deuteronomy the legal expression of the two periods of strife and transition. The advancing development sponsored by the prophets ran finally into the religious law. That law was the death of prophecy (page 400). Following that the powerful coherency of the north kingdom was broken. Soon thereafter came the political end of Judah.

The belief in Judah was that a genuine Mosaic priesthood had been given of the grace of God. Against this a schismatic priesthood in northern Israel had been pressed in of the grace of the king and the people. This is what was held by the later Jews who had the last word, and which must therefore be true (page 132).[4]

The exile had a devastating effect; but it came in time to help the "spiritual," "cultic" tendential development, in so far as the people were by it detached from the old joyous state worship. In pursuance of his philosophical principle, Wellhausen can accord the prophets no more favorable account than this. Particularly significant is that given of Ezekiel, "who, as the times show, opened the way to the inventory of the commonly used ritual of the temple of Jerusalem." He may be regarded as "the link between prophecy and law." The autonomous theocracy, of which nothing before him had ever been thought, was his ideal. He effectually dogmatized the thoughts of his predecessors. With the tendency of the priestly laws, which were completed during the exile, he was in hearty

[4]The covert and far-reaching significance of these words must be studied to be fully characterized. Because the later Jews had the writing of their history they, according to Wellhausena, abused their office, falsified the record, and juggled with revelation.—*The Editor.*

accord. For these laws, as a whole, Wellhausen has only insult and scorn.

The issues which lie in the body of Deuteronomy have developed there. The book is pedantic, senile, archaic; nothing in it is free or of natural growth. Obscure of origin, everything in it runs to a statutory tone ("Proleogmena"). From this recital it is easy to postulate Wellhausen's judgment concerning postexilic times! By the time of the return of the people from the exile and from under a foreign yoke, "the ecclesiastical" had fully swallowed up the political; instead of the earlier strong people, who had been the body politic, was now a weak structure standing in a supranatural phantasy in which the priesthood held absolute authority. "It is not the atmosphere of the old kingdom in which the priest code breathes, but rather that of the congregation of the second temple; consequently it was to a weakened people that such a theological abstraction as we find in postexilic literature is due." ("Prolegomena.")

Characteristic of the after exilic time, according to Wellhausen, was "the nervous concern about particular sins and the unwearied striving after atonement through blood which must be shed: the time of mystery had arrived." In the great day of atonement, "the general cleansing ceremony," the prevailing mood found its high point of expression.

Wellhausen believed that the postexilic period tended almost wholly to inaneness and fabrication: one needs only think on the refinement of the back-dating of the temple to a gray antiquity, as is detected (according to the critics) in the legends of the tabernacle in the priestly code of the Pentateuch! Of the mighty work of an Ezra, which Mauerenbrecher has recently expounded for us, and of the majesty and beauty of the theocratic institute presentation generally, Wellhausen rates the whole to be as good as nothing. He saw everywhere only "arid schemes," and

thought with pensive melancholy on the "early times" of Israel, in which the old folk books "proceeded without show of offense at reprehensible practices and adjustments."

One feels everywhere that this argument runs to the Christian Church! Through Ezra and Nehemiah, Judaism came to be the hierarchy and the church; that is, as the critics would say, it was a uniform religious body in which actual life was no longer found. "The Mosaic congregation is the mother of the Christian Church; the Jews are they who shaped its conception." ("Prolegomena.")

Thus, indeed, according to Wellhausen, stands in chipped-up draughts the whole history of the religion of the Israelites! Step by step, one traces in this history construction, as before affirmed, the spirit of Hegel, and only of Hegel, as the earlier Hegelian philosophy is interpreted: always it flows with a partisan motive, pushing to its objective from beneath to above. One does not need, as Johann Theiss has done, to infer and prove from the new philosophy "the mechanical and *a priori* transference of Darwinism to the realm of religion" in Wellhausen's treatment. Not at all, for it is wholly in the sense of Hegel that Wellhausen has framed the language of his attack.

On one occasion Wellhausen has said: "The critic has not finished his work with the task of mechanical analysis; he must after that advance so as to set the accredited individual Christian in a relation of apposition, as the phase of a living comprehensible process, and on this wise construct a graduated development which is capable of being followed." It was beforehand settled for every Hegelian how such a process and such a gradual development should proceed from beneath upward. It was taken for granted, whatever the confusion and contradiction, that the Scripture "sources" must be in accord with the "development." In this view, freshness and naturalness are always

at the beginning of a development, whilst artificiality and reflection are at the end. This we distinctly saw in the two examples, already considered, of Wellhausen's statements concerning Genesis ii. and Genesis i., etc.

That Deuteronomy must be older than the priest code is deduced by Wellhausen from the Hegelian rule "that the idea as idea is older than the idea as history." Repeatedly, also has one been led to think of this other remark of Wellhausen, namely: "The nature of a thing is proof that the thing has been so fashioned of itself." We know that Hegel has everywhere construed the course of history according to the dreary triad of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. The "development" thus secured does not run in a straight line from lower to higher; rather it is to be reckoned as a regularly recurring retrogression, which not till the next higher step is reached can again be "upheaved."

Of this manner of treatment there are manifold traces in Wellhausen's construction of the history of Israel. We have already seen that, according to Wellhausen, the law no more, as Scripture and tradition are held to teach, can be considered the point of departure of the history of older Israel; but rather that with it (the law) Israelitish history closes, and that this principle (the law) must be reckoned the beginning of the history of post-exilian Judaism. The law which stands within the book of the covenant (the codification of which being "what we are presently concerned with") becomes the thesis. Deuteronomony stands in the midst of the contest, and in the agitation it distinctly speaks forth its reformatory character; its opposition (antithesis) against the established order. The priest code "stands outside and above the quarrel (synthesis), the goal having become a safe possession."

If, as frequently must be the case, one rejects the contention of Wellhausen that such a body of legislation as that contained in the priest code can be thought of as belonging to the cultless period of the exile, he explains that this code

is either only a last putting together and systematizing of old oral traditions, or else he curtly answers the contrary view with: "Always absurd, even if true." "It is," as he sees it, "not an improvement, but is, however, a fact, that on the king follows the high priest, and on the prophet, the rabbi."

In the next section of our argument we shall discuss in detail how and by what means Wellhausen has forced into a system which he holds to be correct those sources of the Old Testament which in their nature are contrary to his view, and first, only this: Against "the development theory" we at present hold an unqualified suspicion, and we know that neither the scheme of the Hegelian thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, nor yet in general the purblind faith in an express train schedule of human advance is answered with any actuality of results.

In the sketch of the history of Israel, as Wellhausen has brought it to statement in classic form, and as it is to-day within the sphere of Old Testament science, widely held to be proven, this "self-conceived dogma," as we have indicated, plays a determinative rôle. Also there has been exhibited the remarkable situation of scholars who in dogmatic question stood under the influence of Kant, or who wholly abjured rationalism, remaining Hegelian in their judgment of the course of the history of Israel. And again, it has been noted that the student of our day who has once demurred to the "dogmatic" of the vapid, spiritless development scheme of Old Testament science, but who has again fallen into it, when it has been urged as absolutely proven, has been unable to bring to bear the energy necessary to cast the error from him.

It can only be matter of surprise, we may now say, that a man like Delitzsch, holding much in common with the philosophy of Wellhausen, and finding wide approval as he draws the last conclusion from Wellhausen's statements,

has not left in waste the whole detail of Old Testament science.

II

The Method Which Wellhausen Employs to Bring the Sources into Harmony with his Philosophical Principle.

Let us now look somewhat narrowly at the method of Wellhausen in using the Old Testament Scriptures to find support for his particular theories. Whilst this process is absolutely various, and whilst it exhibits heterogeneous details, it is yet barely possible to group these into a tolerable order.

When a scholar, or to speak more strictly, a specialist, undertakes to deal scientifically with the literary productions of a remote antiquity, we must, first of all, demand that he shall in the most earnest spirit investigate the original text, if it exists, and if not, that he shall as far as possible seek to restore the same.

It is demanded of the investigator of the writings of the Old Testament that he shall not be content to ground his study in the Masoretic text only, with opportune requisitions upon the reading of the Septuagint; on the contrary, he must have recourse to all materials (the Syriac, the Greek, the Latin, and other versions) that supposedly have been grounded in the original text. H. M. Wiener, in a work which by no means has been widely enough circulated, "How Stands It with the Pentateuch?" has vigorously pointed out this elemental need of the text critic. And now we insistently ask: Is Wellhausen, in his construction of the history of Israel, in correct procedure in this connection? The answer can only be: It is in no wise the case! He has not—so we must affirm—given to text criticism that attention which is its due, but has rather held to the existing Masoretic text. He has, it is true,

repeatedly cited the LXX; however, his conclusions are not according to system, but arbitrary, and that to the highest degree.

Given that a Masoretic text is contrary to the reading of the LXX, when it agrees with Wellhausen's philosophical hypothesis, then the LXX is credited with possessing the highest value. On the contrary, if in the LXX is found a deviation from the Masoretic which is contrary to Wellhausen's former assumption, then is the LXX declared to be useless and without significance. Let it be found that the LXX leaves something out, and that which Wellhausen finds in the Masoretic is not satisfactory, then is the omission of the highest significance. The plus in the Masoretic becomes easily a "foolish correction."

Opponents of Wellhausen's interpretation of history have, according to Wellhausen, really no right at all to use varying readings; and when they do present themselves with philological discussions, then he simply says: "Even philology had to suffer in the fight against Graf; unfortunately it was accustomed to being used like soft wax." He himself, however, must be allowed, whenever convenient, to draw upon "the later date of the language" in proof of his assertions; even the most ancient words (possibly Genesis i.) are sometimes used by him to prove some chapter exceptionally recent. Not till recently has our attention been directed to these regular errors of Wellhausen, even though Klostermann had forcibly, but without effect, pointed them out during the days of Wellhausen's greatest popularity. In England it was the jurist Wiener, who has been mentioned before, who led in pointing out the great need of a systematic textual criticism. In Germany it was especially Joh. Dahse who developed in this domain a very successful activity. After enumerating numerous and important LXX-variations in the abovementioned lecture of his, he, referring to Wellhausen, raises this question (page 21): "Is it really permissible

among scholars to leave all these various readings of the original sources, at their first deviations, unnoticed, or to construe the LXX-text without further ceremony as secondary, possibly even for the reason that it does not harmonize with the usual original variations (*Quellenscheidung*)?"

In the above we are led directly into Wellhausen's second error relative to the text. Not only did Wellhausen pay too little attention to the formation of the text, but at the same time he confuses in a very unreliable manner textual criticism with literary criticism. Let us give just one illustration of this. In the record of Josiah's reform of worship (2 Kings xxii.) the high priest is mentioned several times in the text. But according to Wellhausen's interpretation of the history of Israel the high priest must not appear this early, since the official designation "high priest" is said to be of later origin. Instantly and without the least cause, the "high priest" is juggled out of the text and replaced by the word "priest." The "results" of literary criticism are thus turned to good account, at times, for the reconstruction of the original text, even though they themselves are very unreliable.

The vocabulary of the language of JE and P, for instance, is, according to Wellhausen, very different, one from the other; upon this very thing Wellhausen lays the greatest of importance. Should certain lingual similarity appear, in spite of that, then they are disposed of by Wellhausen as being incidental. If, on the contrary, matters which, according to Wellhausen's theory, should have close connection, so far as time is concerned, but show few lexical connections (continuity), then this tune is raised. "Of lexical continuity there is but little; yet this little is of greatest importance." Whatever seems to make advances toward Wellhausen's premises is, indeed, always "important," and whatever opposes them is deemed "of minor importance." For instance, at one place, he says

contemptuously: "But one example have they unearthed, and that with difficulty," etc. When it becomes necessary, Wellhausen can shift his position, without much ado and with great audacity! Fatal and difficult to explain from the standpoint of Wellhausen's literary-critical assumption is, for instance, the fact that so little is observable of the lawgiving of Jehovah in Leviticus xxvi.; dexterously Wellhausen disentangles himself by saying: "In place of that, the influence of the prophets is so much more manifest." Or we may read the passage ("Prolegomena," page 5): "So far as the literature which has been handed down to us from the times of the kings is concerned, it is difficult for the strongest mind to discover a few ambiguous allusions to the law, which mean nothing, when we remember what Homer meant to the Greeks."

Do you remember what Lessing says, at one place, of his opponent: "Mr. Klotz is forever of the opinion that he is pursuing me. But every time I turn toward him, and that at his earnest solicitation, I see him, far apart, moving along in a cloud of dust, in a path upon which I have never been found"?

Now, let us look more closely into Wellhausen's literary-critical methods which were alluded to above. One who, like Wellhausen, desires to bring order into the documents of past ages, whose reciprocal relations are no longer clear, owes it to us that he examine very intimately the various literary productions separately, so far as they can be separated one from the other by a boundary line. Not until such a study has been carried on in a large measure can lines of communication be drawn from one record to the other. Did Wellhausen proceed in this manner? Even this question must be answered in the negative, speaking for the "Prolegomena." Wellhausen must face the fact that he did not treat the records of the Old Testament books consecutively, but that he placed them at once in relation to the corresponding legislative parts of the

Pentateuch, and *vice versa*. It is, indeed, but self-deception on Wellhausen's part when at times he acts as if he had chosen a different mode of procedure, as, for example, when in an incidental way he raises the question: "Can a correspondence between the phases of the occurrence itself and the giving of the law, in this matter, be shown?" For, as a matter of fact, Wellhausen delineated the "actual occurrence" almost always with an eye on the phases of lawgiving as they presented themselves to him. He thus has no difficulty, of course, in exclaiming confidently ("Prolegomena," page 133): "To place side by side the discernible steps of the development of history and the strata (or periods) of the Pentateuch, is here an easy task."

How can one ever get along with an author who says at the beginning of his statements ("Prolegomena," page 13), "The hypothesis which I lay down will be vindicated anew, from time to time, as we proceed with our investigation"? Let us look into one case (compare "Prolegomena," page 60). Wellhausen sketches the development of sacrifices and continues by saying: "In this sketch the outlines of the different sources blend." But how was this "sketch" gotten? First, Wellhausen (of course, again influenced by the "results of the criticism of the Pentateuch") establishes, as a rule, what belongs to the "exile" compilation of the books of Kings, and carefully does away with all passages which could be construed as opposing his conclusions, and then, conscious of victory, he declares: "Aside from this compilation, one finds nowhere the idea that a sacrifice could be dedicated to the God of Israel and yet be illegitimate." And thus it is always! Things or facts which should be carefully evolved from an original source (for instance, that according to 2 Kings xxii., etc.) are brought into this record from elsewhere, without hesitation and represented to be indisputably correct. What if Wellhausen, toward the end of his work ("Prolegomena," page 366), declared at one place, in cunning self-knowledge:

"Not that everything I have mentioned in the history of worship and tradition is proof of my hypothesis, but rather that much is simply an explanation on the basis of this hypothesis; that is a foregone conclusion." The "Prolegomena" had in most places such an apodistic shape that it rarely becomes clear to the reader that Wellhausen is not dealing with arguments, but simply with meaningless "explanations based on hypothesis."

Having characterized the general error of Wellhausen's literary criticism, let us now notice his erroneous literary-critical methods in detail. I shall content myself with showing four things in particular.

1. I assert: Wellhausen cleared the Old Testament texts of alleged additions of a later date by using inadmissible means, and thus made them available for his own interpretation of the hostiry of Israel. The never-failing expedient which Wellhausen uses to make the sources flexible, so far as the contents are concerned, is the "editor" (redactor). He who knows but little of the Old Testament scholarship of recent decades, knows much about him and his follies, which must always bear the brunt, especially when the critics commit offenses. For that reason I can be brief here, although it is not easy for me to be so; for there is hardly a more ludicrous figure in the history of the world than the ever-ready, now incredibly stupid, then astute "repairer" of the Old Testament text! Wellhausen seems to be on good terms with him and understands how to use his stupid cunning in a very dexterous way. Referring to 1 Samuel vi. 13 ff., where the "editor" has been busy adding to (of course, without noticing that by his additions he grossly spoiled the continuity), Wellhausen writes the following into his remembrance-book: "After the inhabitants have finished, the Levites come in [*Plusquamperfectum*, whatever that may mean!], and act as if nothing had happened, and lift the ark from the wagon, which, in fact, is no longer there, . . . of course simply to comply

with the law, whose demands are ignored in the original story."

Wellhausen, however, was himself not unconscious of the fact that his criticism often looks like "nothing but arbitrary criticism." We go even farther than he and say that it is nothing but this *all the time!* Whether customs and languages are ancient or recent in Israel is rarely settled by Wellhausen through circumstantial evidence, but it all depends upon one thing—namely, whether the passage in which they are mentioned is needed by Wellhausen in his interpretation of history as ancient or recent. That the "sacral communion" in connection with the sacrifice belongs to the most ancient conception of sacrifice is to be considered certain. But it happens that it is also found in the Old Testament in a chapter which is an indispensable support to the so-called "Codex of the priests." Since this "Codex of the priests" is held by the critics to be a composition of recent date, then of course a passage like this is simply "a lost remnant of an ancient custom." Or another example! In 1 Samuel vii. 22 is mentioned what seems to be a very old custom ("Drawing water before Jahwe") in a record which, according to Wellhausen's customary assumptions, cannot be ancient and yet cannot be tracable at all unless considered such. Wellhausen simply says in that connection ("Prolegomena," page 245): "To the whole story there cannot be a thread of truth, but the motives are very apparent." Wellhausen is never at a loss for an argument when it becomes necessary to place a link in the chain of his system! One cannot help but be amazed, and that continuously, especially when the "Codex of the priests" is under discussion, in reference to which Wellhausen's argumentation is most faulty.

The poor "Codex of the priest," unfortunately, can never please Wellhausen! In every case is it given the sentence which the Patriarch received in Lessing's

Nathan: "Nothing avails! The Jew must burn!" Even though the new moon festivities, which at a later day were crowded out ("Prolegomena," page 108), still play a part; yes, even though he detects demons (as Azazel) which stand in crassest opposition to the abstruse monotheism which Wellhausen ascribes to it; yet nothing can save this writing from Wellhausen's apodictical conclusion: it is derived from later sources. Whatever is found in it that points to ancient days is "archaic embellishment," or something similar, terms which Wellhausen is ever ready to use. Even "*argumenta e silentio*," at which Wellhausen usually scoffs, are, if used by Wellhausen himself, permissible and conclusive. Thus, speaking of the burning of incense ("Prolegomena," page 64), he says: "Surely at least one of the prophets would have made mention of it, had it really been of such importance."

As to the writers of the "Codex of the priests," they, according to Wellhausen, compete even with the "redactor" (editor), and it comes to artfulness and mediocre endowments, at the same time. Jerusalem, "the historic headquarters of the priests," is not even mentioned in their writings "for archaic reasons"; with a "studiousness that is very noticeable" they bury in silence the capital city and the temple, which indeed is the propelling power of the whole institution. The fact is, they have sought, and that with great diligence, to cling to the 'costume' of the mosaic age and to conceal their own wherever possible. By so doing, all their works are given an ancient coloring. One can see at once what can really be proven by such methods! At times the writers of the "Codex of the priests" have made changes in some things that were against them by "harmless additions." ("Prolegomena," page 116, note 1.) And then again—and that must be ascribed to their mediocrity—were they so nearsighted that they invented an altar which was practically useless in their tabernacle, a product of imagination; for accord-

ing to Wellhausen ("Prolegomena," page 37) they conceded that the brazen altar was made transportable by changing its quintessence (Kern?) into a piece of carpentry. Unfortunately they failed to publish a commentary which contained an explanation, saying which of their writings were to be taken seriously and which were "archaic embellishments"!

"It is incredible," Wellhausen exclaims ("Prolegomena," page 153), "how much eventually has to be given up. What originally had gone along, side by side, is put in a pile; whatever was free and undirected is measured and prescribed." Although the history of the world shows that people who passed through experiences similar to Israel during and after the exile usually held to the old customs with great tenacity, especially among the higher classes, and handed them down to their posterity; yet, according to Wellhausen, the Jews, for a change, did just the opposite; they had but little regard for their past history and laid claim only to the Mosaic period with its reflected splendor of David's time. Or to be more exact, they fabricated even out of the history of these epochs a new picture, which in no wise represented the truth. "The theocratic conception took first place in their thinking and striving after the days of the exile, and destroyed the objective sense of truth, the esteem of, and interest in, facts that had been handed down to them." "The writers after the exile disposed of the institutions of Israel's antiquity in a most reckless manner." (Compare "Prolegomena," page 50.)

With a people of such a frame of mind one need not be surprised, according to Wellhausen, that no one among them noticed the cunningly devised falsifications with which the writers of the "Codex of the priests" are charged.

2. I assert again: Wellhausen has drawn unwarranted conclusions from the writings "illuminated" by himself,

and as a historian was not studious enough to obtain necessary objectiveness. One of his most common errors is that he deals in false generalizations. Instances which in kind are unique and very unusual are often taken by him as typical. Think of what Wellhausen has made himself believe based upon the "sacrifice" which Gideon offered (Judges vi. 19) and made it fit in with his theory. (Compare "Prolegomena," pages 56, 61, 66, 122.) Since the example given can hardly be construed as a sacrifice at all, nothing, of course, can be learned from it which would throw any light upon the customary system of sacrifice of ancient days. But let us grant for a moment that in the case cited we have the record of a real sacrifice; yet Wellhausen has no authority to use it in the way he does! For Gideon had a right to do things in an unusual way, he being in a very unusual position, according to the record. One certainly cannot expect, as Theiss points out, "that every Israelite, especially a warrior, was fully and perfectly informed in matters of his faith and was able under any and all circumstances to speak of it intelligently and live up to it." It is so in the story in Judges xvii., from which Wellhausen has drawn the most impossible conclusions. (Compare "Prolegomena," page 123.) Or, I point the reader to Amos v. 25, where the speaker is under the impulse of deepest emotions, from which Wellhausen would conclude that there was no sacrifice at all during the wanderings in the desert. On the other hand, he glides with greatest facility over single statements of the Old Testament [as, for instance, concerning the "sacrosanctity" (?) of the ark, 1 Sam. vi. 19] which can be used against him. Wiener at one place mentions a peculiarly remarkable instance of this kind and says correctly: "It is so easy to prove any theory, if only the facts are selected judiciously."

Upon the "authentic witness of the prophets" Wellhausen sets "the greatest, and indeed only, validity"

("Prolegomena," page 47, note), and he actually values highly some of their utterances, of course, unable to prevent false conclusions (as in Amos v. 25, mentioned above). But if the prophets produce matter that does not fit in with Wellhausen's interpretation of the history of Israel, then he takes but little notice of them, or adopts the never-failing method of denying the prophets' right to those passages. I am reminded in this connection of Hosea viii. 12, where the prophet makes mention of many "written" references, which point to a much more copious legal material than could, according to Wellhausen, have been extant in the pro-Hosean times. If one will familiarize himself with Wellhausen's manner of reasoning, even though in only a very superficial manner, he can in reading some prophetical chapter always know, in advance, how Wellhausen will "utilize" it. On the whole, I think Theiss is perfectly correct when he exclaims:

> It is nothing less than a declaration of bankruptcy on the part of scholarly investigation if it adopts such gigantic "hypotheses of deception" (as Wellhausen's) in order to evade the original sources. What reckless method of procedure is this: First is drawn a historic picture which is exactly the contrary of what the original authorities intend to present, and then they are accused of deceiving, and then again of only being deceived, because their version does not harmonize with the altered shape! What arbitrary method Wellhausen does use; and Delitzsch is even worse. In matters that suit them they use the original sources, and in matters that do not fit in with their arbitrary method of teaching and of giving history, they accuse the writers of deceiving or being deceived.

It is true that in our day we do not expect absolutely correct hypotheses (*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*) on the part of a historian, for that is impossible; but we do expect of him that he should always strive after correct objectivity. In Wellhausen's writing not much of such striving is observable: Times and persons that are sympathetic to him are often magnified unduly, while times and persons that do not suit him are depreciated in every possible

way. Instances are cited. At times one thinks he hears a defender and then again a prosecutor at court; the balanced, discriminating historian rarely speaks. It is very evident that by methods like these violent hands are laid on the original and that the reader's path is obstructed, so that he finds it difficult to obtain clearness in the matter of age and value of the original sources. One example which we shall examine more closely will strengthen this assertion. It is well known that the books of Chronicles do not measure up with the more ancient historic writings of Israel, so far as value of primary sources is concerned. (As do the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings.) Yet, the possibility must be admitted (and later investigations have proven these possibilities to have become facts) that even in Chronicles important information is given us in detail concerning Israel's past history. Wellhausen rarely lets an opportunity pass to strike Chronicles a blow. He makes great concessions when he allows himself to say concerning these books, "It is probable that among the chaff some good seed may be found," and when he admits "that Chronicles owes its existence not to the arbitrariness of an individual, but to a general tendency of a period of time (*Zeitrichtung*). Often his tone is much stronger: "Chronicles contains nothing but inventions; it is out of the question that in it we have any record of the traditions of the time before the exile." The most offensive expressions are used by Wellhausen when he speaks about the writer of Chronicles, whether he affirms of him as giving "an epilogue of his own making" or says that "he interlards his discussion, wherever it seems weak, with prophets blowing their trumpets and Levites making music." According to Wellhausen ("Prolegomena," page 176), the Chronicler makes of David "a precentor and liturgist at the head of a bunch of priests and Levites." Or he says ("Prolegomena," page 175): "The monotony

is broken at times by nothing but pious talk, which, however, never is interesting." We ask, Is that the tone of a historian who should study the period about which he writes in a sympathetic manner, or is it the voice of a pamphleteer? Hatred against Judaism led Wellhausen here, as often elsewhere, to choose inappropriate expressions. It is not at all surprising that Delitzsch, at a later day, in his hatred of Judaism, went even further than Wellhausen, and heaped upon most of the Old Testament derision of the same kind.

"Also, positive data as given by the recorders," Wellhausen says at one place, "which refer to the adopted methods of worship of some king, are as a rule repeated verbatim, and are found here and there and at once discernible, in the effusions at celebrations, in sermons, in the choruses of the Levites, in the law and the prophets." It is true, an attentive reader will notice the dogmatism and schematism of the Chronicler at every step; that much must be admitted. Even Luther did not fail to recognize that; but does one have to speak of Chronicles with as much hatred as Wellhausen habitually does? At the same time, Wellhausen did not fail to make use of statements taken from the books of Chronicles whenever they suited his interpretation of history. (Compare, for instance, "Prolegomena," page 45.) Let us put it concisely: The treatment which Wellhausen gives the books of Chronicles is as unsatisfactory and as unworthy or unbecoming a historian as it possibly could be. Wiener's conclusion, especially as referring to the book of Chronicles, is entitled to be heard: "With many scholars of the present the correctness of the hypothesis (referring to Wellhausen's interpretation of the history of Israel) is made to be equivalent with the dogma itself." That Wellhausen did not take pains to get the desired objectivity so needful in a historian is noticeable on every page of his "Prolegomena." He seems to have been

wholly unacquainted with the well-known principle of jurisprudence "*in dubio pro reo.*" Without hesitation he suspects every individual character mentioned in the history of Israel in order that he may make his interpretation of the history credible. Theiss, after having enumerated all the persons of the Old Testament who, according to Wellhausen, were deceivers or deceived, made this assertion: "Wellhausen's hypothesis is one of deception, pure and simple." Think, for instance, of Josiah's reformation of worship in the year 620. Wellhausen accuses the unknown authors of Deuteronomy (D), which is said to have been published then by Josiah for the first time, with the most incredible artfulness. They are accused of having attempted a unity of worship and are said to have added paragraphs to their law for the purpose of making provision for the grove-priests of Jahwe(?) (*Jahwehöhenpriester*), who, it was anticipated, would be without a support by introducing a unity of worship; and, more than that, they are said to have represented these priests, in this law attributed to Moses, as already in need of a support. The reformation of worship itself was, according to Wellhausen, a performance in which the parts were carefully assigned ahead of time. At one place he says: "The prophets and priests seem to have worked in perfect harmony. The high priest Hilkiah was the first to allude to the found book which was to lay the foundation for their selfishly conceived structure; the prophetess Hulda affirmed its divine content; the priests and prophets formed a prominent part of the congregation in which the new law was published and sworn to, and we are at liberty to conclude that the ends reached at that time were not for purposes of worship only. The fact is that such changing of the worship suited the interests of both parties. In addition to this, the chronicler took the liberty, later, of making a slight falsification of his own when he was describing Josiah's reformation of wor-

ship. (Compare "Prolegomena," page 197, and my Josiah-writings, pages 60 and 112.) Exactly as in the case of this occurrence in the history of Israel, where Hilkiah, Hulda, and others are strongly suspected by Wellhausen, but without any ground, so the authors of the "Codex of the priests" and Ezra have to endure the accusation of being extremely artful in connection with the reformation of worship in 445 B.C. I shall not discuss this again in detail; all details concerning it are found in my book "Die Kultusreformation des Ezra," 1921. At times Wellhausen has invented whole stories in order to harmonize his hypotheses with the original sources. Thus he drew from 2 Kings xxiii. 9 a long story which he repeatedly presents as absolutely true ("Prolegomena," pages 118, 113, and 140), although in the originals no mention is made of it. The fact is that he has arranged the story of the personnel of worship to suit himself, whenever the authorities were silent in the matter, even though he does have to make liars and deceivers out of all kinds of persons. We made mention elsewhere that even Ezekiel did not find mercy at the hands of this inquisitor.

3. Wellhausen would scarcely have attempted to make such vulnerable assertions—and that introduces another source of his errors—if he had not taken such a strange attitude toward the religion of Israel. His interest is centered almost exclusively on "things extant" which, in matters of religion and worship, were prevalent in Israel, and not, as Wellhausen pretends, on a revealed religion, introduced into Israel by strangers and which always remain foreign to them. Popular religion Wellhausen would extirpate, and establish such religion as is found at the time being. Unfortunately, he fails to explain what he means by the term "popular religion." If a prophet denounced something, at once Wellhausen concludes that that was the customary thing to do in that day; no one but the prophet found objection to it, and, what is more,

that which is denounced was considered essential in the piety of the Israelites of that day. If, for instance, the prophets accused their contemporaries of "following after strange gods," then Wellhausen concludes, at once, that only to these preachers of repentance did the worship of images seem heathenish, but of course not to the people as a whole. Commenting on Hosea ix. 6, he says ("Prolegomena," page 94): "We need not be disturbed when the prophet here again places the worship, which is doubtless meant for Jahwe, on the same level with the worship of the heathen, with which indeed it differed but little so far as can be seen. It is sufficient that, once again, it is made clear how the popular worship of God was conducted at that time." Would that Wellhausen had at times been "disturbed" at such and similar passages! Then indeed he would not have given such a caricature of the development of the religion of Israel, as unfortunately he did! Then he hardly would have worked so advantageously into the hands of the writer of the "Great Deception," as he unfortunately did, which author unblushingly affirms that the God of the Old Testament was the God of a religion of one's liking and had nothing at all to do with the Creator of the world as conceived by Christianity.

Of course, it is easy for Wellhausen to explain in his own way that virtually everything that is offensive and bad is normal, whether it be idolatry or what not! If anything is forbidden in the law, Wellhausen assures us, at once, that that is exactly what was custom at that time! Do not fail to notice the surprising use which Wellhausen makes of Deuteronomy xvi. 21, for instance; and let us examine this statement ("Prolegomena," page 281): "The golden ox-images which Jeroboam erected differed probably in the quality of the gold, but not in their real purpose, from the ephods and other idols which were found in every house of worship; as, for example, the brazen serpent in Jerusalem." The fact is, he continually seeks to put the worship

of the Northern kingdom, which is generally severely condemned in the Old Testament, upon the same footing with that of the Southern kingdom. That it appeared at a later day that even at a much earlier time there obtained a purer form of religion in Judah, he ascribes to this fact alone, which has been alluded to before, that the history of Israel still extant was written by authors who came from the Southern kingdom. When Ezekiel censures his people because they permitted foreigners in their temple at Jerusalem, Wellhausen does not indeed conclude that somewhere this must have been forbidden; instead he says ("Prolegomena," page 116): "From this we learn that it had always been forbidden to keep holy things from the touch of the profane, but that in Solomon's temple even heathen, probably prisoners of war, were used in some of the services, which, according to the law, only the Levites could perform." Somewhat apologetically he adds: "Of course, Ezekiel considered that custom as an abominable abuse." It is not surprising that Wellhausen makes the discovery that but little distinction was made between idolatry and the grove worship of Jahve (?) as found in Israel, in an effort to develop a "popular religion." Wellhausen goes so far as to say of Ezekiel that to him the worship of the groves (?) was considered idolatry. ("Prolegomena," page 117.) Where plain distinctions are drawn in the Old Testament touching these matters, they are attributed by Wellhausen to "later revisions" or they are called interpolations of some unimportant individual reviser and must not be considered in the general plan.

It is very evident that the greatest wrong is done to the religion of Israel by this method of procedure, when it is remembered that this religion is not developed out of popular customs and individual errors, but out of material given us in the law and the prophets. Whenever we wish to get acquainted with the nature of original Protestantism, we consult Luther's writings, the "Confessio Augus-

tana," etc.; but we do not recognize those things as characteristic which were thought and said, here and there, within the area which had become evangelical, but which things were severely condemned by the evangelical preachers. And, of course, we must proceed, in all justice, in a similar way with the Catholic Church. If we fail to do that, then we get caricatures similar to those which Wellhausen has drawn of the religion of Israel!

The error which Wellhausen committed has lately been severely censured. Eduard Koenig, for instance, whom we have mentioned repeatedly, spoke unequivocally against the abuse which has lately been practiced in referring to the conception of "the popular religion of Israel": he refers to Wellhausen's method of representing the many offensive things in the history of the life of the people of Israel, of which the Bible often speaks, as being normal, on this wise: "The Old Testament teaching's decision upon these practices, according to which they were disobedient, apostate, etc., is stifled." His decision is that it had come to a fine point with "the misrepresentations of the leaders of the history of Israel." Sellin, too, notices and very clearly says that the time has come when we must see these things more clearly; we need to know, he says ("Das Alte Test.," etc., page 14), that there always had been in Israel, as elsewhere, "representatives of true religion"; from them we must learn, if we would know the true state of religion of those days. As a matter of course, I do not wish to say by this that I would eliminate altogether the concept of "popular religion" from scientific discussions. As a whole, I agree with the last mentioned scholar of Berlin when he says at one place that we of this day are led to see the difference between the popular religion which finally developed into the Jewish religion of law and the "divine revelation of the prophets" by using methods of scholarship and comparing religions. I simply wanted to show without hewing closely to the line that one cannot

but get into a difficulty from which one cannot be extricated, just as the case with Wellhausen.

4. We come to the last section of this chapter by saying that Wellhausen certainly would have found much greater opposition on the part of the theologians to his remarkable method of criticism, if he had not understood to practice, in a masterful way, the saying: "Offense is the best method of defense." He attacks every one, with every possible weapon, who opposes him or who might oppose him! As a rule he treats his opponents with the greatest disrespect (if he does not ignore them altogether), or with sarcasm; for that reason, he should say but little if, at times, he is repaid in kind. This same gentleman, who, as we have said before, so often imagined things, when arguments are wanting, remarks incidentally ("Prolegomena," page 29): "This gives material to the interpreters for the development of a little family romance." This same man, who was an expert at the inventions of imaginary suppositions, declares ("Prolegomena," page 193): "The interpreters are inclined to adopt the method of using auxiliary suppositions (*Hilfsannahmen*); but by that method they may proceed indefinitely, without reaching a goal, for the mistake is terrible." Whoever opposes Wellhausen is, according to his judgment "a critic as unconstrained in his prejudice as in his knowledge of things," or is branded a "theological Sisyphus," who endeavors "to roll the stone uphill, whether it be halfway down or down altogether." Whoever says anything in favor of Chronicles is, according to Wellhausen, an "advocate" of this book; and, if he depends on this book for information concerning the conditions in Israel, then he must be prepared to be called "one who is wise in his own conceits." Everywhere Wellhausen scents false apologetic and warns against it in the manner of Job's friends, in urging him to take a stand for God.

The fact is that Wellhausen goes a step farther and doubts the soundness of mind of his opponents. In all

circles, he says, in the beginning of his "Prolegomena" (page 9), where any recognition for scholarly results is claimed at all, it is accepted that Deuteronomy was written in the period when it was discovered and that it was at the bottom of the reformation of King Josiah. Even to the most positive opposing arguments Wellhausen, as a rule, is wholly inaccessible; he often tries in a most surprising manner to deprive them of their value. At one time he shouts with emphasis to his critics: "Prove to me first of all that the difference between the priests and the Levites is recognized in the genuine Old Testament and that Ezekiel, especially, does not treat it as new, but as having been made in the very beginning." But he alone, of course, is to say what belongs to a "genuine Old Testament," and how Ezekiel is to be interpreted. If a scholar presents a passage which opposes Wellhausen's theory, then he is made to understand, and that in a very decisive manner, that this very passage has been proved to have "originated at a very late date." (Compare also "Prolegomena," page 269.) In each and every case the opponent must hush. If the text does not harmonize with Wellhausen's interpretation of history at all, and if by the use of the shears he cannot cut it down to suit himself, then he offers the doubter this turning: "In spite of all differences, the general similarity is clear!" In this way Wellhausen, of course, succeeds in gaining his point in every case.

I trust that the examples which I have given, and which could be multiplied indefinitely, will disclose to all how, in reality, matters are with Wellhausen's methods. That these methods have been continued in use by his followers, with more or less dexterity and have even been enlarged upon, every one knows who has busied himself with the Old Testament scientific literature of recent decades.

I close this chapter by giving a few excerpts from John Theiss in which is presented concisely what we tried to

show in the above: "The followers of Wellhausen and Delitzsch (as well as Wellhausen himself) deprive the original sources of their value before using them and do not allow them to speak in their proper place and manner and with their unstrained meaning, but silence them first in all things that do not suit them, by declaring them to be an editorial growth, exuberances of the commentator, or the imagination of the writer, on a grand scale. That the writings which have been so arbitrarily deformed, crippled, and disjointed can no longer furnish authoritative statements is very evident. In all justice, it is demanded that the Old Testament texts be critically examined before they are used. And one must also acknowledge that Wellhausen's followers have sharpened the vision of others in their literary-critical and textual-critical problems of the Old Testament; but right here is where they miss their mark by going in a circle, in that they are trying to prove, by anticipating them, the religious schemata, as well as those of the history of worship, all of which they try to prove by literary-critical methods. If we are to get our correct bearings of the Old Testament scholarship anew, which indeed is made a duty to us of the present day in Delitzsch's writings, then we must refuse to accept methods which in the long run are not endurable!

III.

Departure from Wellhausen in Our Day!—On New Path toward New Goal!

In the introduction to this essay it was said that the influence of Wellhausen over the majority of Old Testament scholars has been immeasurably great in our day. However, in the same connection, and in the chapter immediately preceding this, we pointed out the fact that the time of the almost complete ascendancy of Wellhausen's doctrines over the professorial chairs of Old

Testament science in Germany seems to be nearing an end. Various circumstances indicate this. Upon these we have, here and there, made observations in the course of our argument. However, we will now place them in a more connected order.

The philosophical hypothesis with which Wellhausen comes to the criticism of the Old Testament to many of us, during the past year, has appeared always stranger and stranger. Wellhausen was simply intoxicated with his "development thinking." He followed with glowing interest the advance of humanity, and trusted to the high accomplishments of his own craft. As we have already said, he saw in the history of Israel a race example of the correctness of the Hegelian theory of development. Therefore, before the transcendent God of the Old Testament this champion of immanence stood in complete helplessness.

For not a few of us to-day the relation of race history lies quite otherwise than Wellhausen has postulated. The development idea, since the World War, and since the revelations of Spengler's "Decay of the Western Empires," exercises no more that fascination of actuality which was the case in the first decade following the publication of the "Prolegomena." For the theory of an outright immanence multitudes of us cannot be as enthusiastic as was Wellhausen. To-day we see rationalism defeated in Wellhausen, and ask: Can one as unfriendly to all supernaturalism as was he be capable of understanding and validating the through and through supernatural, divine presentation of truth found in the Old Testament Scriptures?

We have already directed attention to Heim's antagonism to the childish "development" dogma. Also Sellin, one of the leading Old Testament scholars of the present day, stands on altogether different philosophical ground from that occupied by the author of the "Prolegomena."

In Sellin we meet this, namely: "The methods employed by the Divine Will in the history of Israel are beyond the power of human instrumentality to fathom." I find myself often thinking also on this sentence from Sellin: "On the one side, touching the religion of Israel, there is close contiguity with the old Oriental folk religion, and a show of being influenced through it; on the other, a new, peculiar factor which we nowhere else discover, at least, in such clearness and strength—namely, the wisdom of the one merciful, however, above all, just and holy God; which wisdom partly moves in sharpest opposition to the folk religion, and partly unites with it and seeks to give it form."

Wellhausen incidentally admits the bankruptcy of his philosophical conclusions when, on his own premise, he characterizes as being inexplicable "the fact that the Israelitish history, from an approximately definite beginning, led to a definite end, in somewhat the same manner as did the history of the Moabites." Whoever knows anything certainly, must allow that Wellhausen's conclusions have altogether failed his premises.

Not alone in their philosophical views has a departure from Wellhausen by many Old Testament scholars been begun; but during the last three decades one can but have been strongly impressed that the historian Wellhausen was possessed of an insincere inactivity as regards the history of Israel. The emergence of new problems has caused the eye of inquiry to be constantly cast in Wellhausen's direction. As we have said in a former section, Wellhausen took as his measure for the judgment of early Israel "the content of Old Arabic heathenism," before the time when Mohammed borrowed from it what he would. The thing which must, therefore, be explained is that he (Wellhausen) has represented as thinkably primitive and barbaric a people migrating out of Egypt as late as the last third of the second millennium before

Christ. From this notation, he has concluded that the religion of Israel, in its beginning, as other religions, must have developed, for instance, as did the polydemonistic cult of the pre-Islamic Arabs, from which the norm of the Israelitish faith was directly derived. Yet, according to Winkler, Jeremias, Gunkel, Gressman, Ungnad, and others, the influence of the old Babylonian culture on the primitive history of Israel has been clearly established.

Of Egypt also, from which the Israelites migrated, we are constantly learning more as a land of primitive culture; and of the Semitic Peninsula that it, as well, was, at this time, "under the influence of Egypt, so far as Arabic high culture" stood.[5] [Wellhausen has left these accumulating data out of his reckoning. The march of Assyriology and Egyptology has left his theories and their conclusions disastrously belated.]

Wellhausen's view of the course of Israelitish history—that is, his development order: Nomad religion, agricultural religion, the prophets' religion, legal religion—must be changed, as regards his first two steps, to conform to the pressure of new facts. The result of excavations in the Orient speaks loudly against his scheme. One learns, particularly through the discoveries at Tel-el-Amarna and the recent excavations in Palestine, that the culture status of the then existing times was far higher than has been commonly supposed. In strong language Kittel has described the situation, after which he concludes that that which Wellhausen and his school have named the antiquity of the Mosaic and immediately pre-Mosaic times in Palestine, by reason of the new discoveries, has receded to a Palestine middle age, indeed, to the time of the beginning of the culture at the height of the third, and almost the whole of the second, millennium before Christ.

[5]During his forty years of shepherd life in Horeb, Moses would not have been out of touch with the culture of Egypt, nor out of knowledge of the religious state of his people.—*The Editor.*

In a glance at Wellhausen's history construction, Kittel says: "The building failed in its foundation, and the architect failed in his plan."

We must to-day take Israel out of its whole historic setting, if in the time of Moses, and in the century which followed, it actually stood upon the low step of culture described by Wellhausen. But the historicity of Abraham, considered by Wellhausen to be all but impossible, is again on the ground of the strongest probability, and the actuality of the patriarchal religion, which Eduard Koenig warmly defends, fully established. It is the same with the fact of Moses. While, as we have seen that in every voluminous legislational activity, Wellhausen has decided against Moses, and while he regarded him as only "a great unknown," proof comes through the discovery in Susa of the Hammurabic code, with its "laws of the time of Abraham," "that the order of, first, the prophets, then the law, is incorrectly taken," and that we correctly place Moses as the great lawgiver of his people.

Sellin, who supposes the dependence of the Israelitish law to rest, in the large, upon Western Asiatic culture circles, holds it to be thoroughly credible that Moses is indicated as lawgiver. That one under the influence of Egyptian culture, and equally in intellectual association with not uncultivated Midianites, as was Moses, should be denied the ability necessary to the creation of a legislation of commanding character, appears to us to-day as laughable. One can, however, well understand this when the last-named scholar (Sellin), in a glance at the archæological discoveries of the last thirty years, and in a review of our present knowledge of Babylonian, Egyptian, and Palestinian culture, frankly declares that it is to him clear "that Wellhausen has starkly misinterpreted the pre-prophetic Israelitish religion."

It is now that we begin to see the middle period of the history of Israel in a way manifold otherwise than Well-

hausen has done. Eichrodt has an essay meant to show what its title asks: "Has There Been Opened Up a New Path to the Solution of the Deuteronomic Question?" In this essay he proves, in various arguments to that end, that Deuteronomy is otherwise that Wellhausen has conceived it to be, and alien from the relation in which he has sought to settle it in the history of Israel. And I have, in my two already published books ("The Religious Reformation of Josiah," Leipsic, 1919, and "The Religious Reformation of Ezra," Gütersloh, 1921), brought forward the proof that the sections 2 Kings xxii., etc., and Nehemiah viii.-x. have decisive significance for the history of Israel, but have been by Wellhausen and his school most incorrectly interpreted.

Gunkel has declared: "That of late from the advancing stage of opinion, and also from the side of science, it is loudly heard that the collective picture of Wellhausen is drawn without reference to other Oriental peoples than the Israelites; and although Oriental development has advanced in recent times to an unexpected extent, the picture has not been sufficiently altered to answer to this advance. The school, especially in its younger representatives, has more and more intrenched itself in a necessarily self-protective, yet always unfruitful, literary criticism."

It has finally become plain that the methods of Wellhausen, which we have characterized in detail, are, more and more, being discounted by the thought of the new time. There is also a pronounced abatement of interest in those questions of literary criticism with which, as is affirmed by Gunkel in the quotation above, Wellhausen and his school have been so largely engaged. Whilst up to the beginning of the last century in Old Testament research in Germany it was strongly held as being doubtful if a uniformly taken passage of Scripture could be ascribed to a multitude of authors, or made to discover a new succession of redactors, one comes now widely to under-

stand that the complex composition of the Old Testament Scriptures in multitudes of cases is such that the work once ascribed to Moses is not to be cherished as such. Followers of Wellhausen have gone everywhere. with error-led ingenuity, seeking for "contradictions and inconsistencies" in the Old Testament Scriptures which bring always to new "source separations"; but we now rather more discuss the questions which concern the individuality of the Scriptures found in the astonishing character which they possess.

Sellin, for instance, asked this pertinent question: "Is there a single other ancient people than Israel who possess a primitive history held together and carried of a so distinctly divine plan and thought?" And Norden in his "Kunstprosa" develops literature points of which Wellhausen and his school have scarcely so much as dreamed. Of Norden's statement I present here a single sentence: "It was the custom of antiquity that the man could change his dress at pleasure, but not himself." So far do those scholars who turn from Wellhausen regarding a text and literature criticism trouble themselves to treat of new literary history points. Dahse, who, in his book, "Critical Text Materials for the Hexateuchal Question," has laid his finger very impressively on the sorest spot of the Wellhausen text and literature criticism, has also stated the new principle thus: "We are obliged, in the case of each verse, each word indeed, to invoke the help of the old translations to determine what the primitive text is, before we in any wise reach a conclusion as to a possible source. It becomes the reproach of the prevailing criticism that in the analysis of any given chapter it has in the fewest cases troubled itself concerning the history which the Bible text has furnished; it has mostly built its hypothesis upon the work of the modern day Hebraist."

Shortly before Dahse, the Hollander, Erdmans, in his various writings against the Wellhausen art, text, and

literature criticism, gave notice of warfare; and with Dahse contemporaneously contends the already oftenmentioned Englishman, H. M. Wiener, in his writings against Wellhausen's faulty methods in this field. The arguments of both these investigators carry a definitely penetrating force. Before them the wrong conclusions of Wellhausen have been distinctly uncovered.

Wellhausen has dealt craftily with the rule for early codified material, and where a statement in any of its particulars presents a contradiction he straightway declares the whole content to be unbelievable. And yet everyone knows that in all statements made in late literary form an older content is always present, and that "first of all, the general content of the source must be recognized as the safe foundation of the traditional fact, especially if the source in any particular deviates from the rest." Sellin spoke in 1913 a distinctly prophetic word concerning the "new structure which must and will come"; and, according to Gunkel, the contest concerning the results and methods of Wellhausen are yet at the beginning, and can "through no boastful word of that school be delayed or put aside." All in all, the turning aside from Wellhausen has proceeded to a surprising degree!

It seems to me that a result would have been reached earlier and more fully if someone on the inside of theology had at that time had the courage fully to expose the absurd consequences which have come to the work of Wellhausen as philosopher, historian, and specialist in methods.

In keeping always clearly before one's eye the "results" of Wellhausen's processes, one finds it impossible to be astonished that Delitzsch in numberless cases, as Harnack in a more cautious way, has brought into doubt the dignity of the Old Testament. And for my personal self, I candidly affirm that should I come to the scientific conclusion that Wellhausen has been right, for instance, concerning the status of Deuteronomy and the priest code, it would

EVANGELICAL

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

happen in like manner with my esteem for extensive portions of the Old Testament canon. Let the critics discourse of "the proof of a dogmatic agreement," but every logical-minded layman must call the thing by its right name—falsehood!

Wellhausen and his disciples may go on and account as the expression of "prophetic ideas" much that is in Deuteronomy; he and his school even conveniently may have reached an understanding as to necessary conclusions of the priest code; but if these works in reality stood as Wellhausen thinks they stand, the end of his argument would not justify the means; so holds the once delivered judgment of the prophet Jeremiah concerning law fabrications. From this law and also from "the adventure of such bungling work done upon our holy books" must we each and all pray for deliverance. One, however, at no time forgets that Wellhausen has said that "the specific character of the Israelitish history, as it appears in the existing presentation, and which itself has designedly woven into the sacred narrative, rests, for the most part, in an additional painting over the primitive picture."

Delitzsch has also in like manner left very much else unproven. Until the time of Delitzsch's departure many theologians were quite ignorant of the fact that a reaction against Wellhausen, a "crisis in Old Testament criticism," had been precipitated. Dahse said that "if one should open the two German encyclopedias, 'The Hauck Encyclopedia of Useful Knowledge' and the collective work, 'Religion in History and the Present,' he would find therein no syllable concerning a crisis." Delitzsch has unintentionally rendered a great service to the opponents of Wellhausen in that through him this latent, and to the Wellhausen school not possible, crisis has become acute.

And what is the new way on which one can arrive at a conclusive judgment concerning the history of Israel, and particularly of the history of the Israelitish religion?

We have already spoken variously to this end, therefore now only briefly. If we would enter inquiringly into the Old Testament Scriptures, we must, so it seems to me, be philosophically clear on one point—namely, that with the collective authorship of the Old Testament Scriptures is the conclusion that a personal, over-the-world-standing, and never-absenting God directs the affairs of the world and of mankind. From the standpoint of the immanence and the evolutionism of the critical view we will undertake to say nothing here as to the Old Testament and its thought contents. As little as a native of China, untouched by European culture, can understand a symphony of Beethoven, so little can a partisan of the immanence and evolutional view of the history of the religion of Israel actually penetrate that history as pictured to us in the Old Testament. His judgment is fixed to follow a "perverted angle of vision."

We demand to-day of the judge of a work of art that he should be able to "feel." The history of Israel, and more particularly the religion of that people, are works of art. Whoever makes assault on these with a clumsy weapon of rationalism cannot expect them to open to him their treasures. Whoever philosophically, and yet more religiously, is separated through the world from the considerations which prevail throughout the Old Testament has lost the hold of his own hands.

The words of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians ii. 14 have to-day the fullness of their verity. Kittel, in his Leipsic lecture, as also Sellin in his writing of the Old Testament, have each argued, if variously, yet in a similar sense. Both are clearly convinced that during the last ten years on the inside of Old Testament science the religious value of the Old Testament was possibly being more fully appraised, and that here a chief output of the future of that science is indicated.

The presence of a so fully comprehensible element in

the sense and spirit of the Old Testament Scriptures argues naturally that for the verification of the contents of the canon we do not need to employ particularly severe methods of historical science. As a matter of course, the Old Testament is not regarded by the critical investigator as a supernaturally manifested and divinely inspired book. Also to the scholar who discovers everywhere in the Old Testament a divine genius it must, as to its genesis and tradition, be appraised as a human book; and otherwise, from the viewpoint of historical science, it is to be judged as any other book is judged. Sellin fittingly says: "The Old Testament is a human writing which bears the authority of a divine revelation, which has itself been fulfilled in the course of the history of a people." The object of a scientific work on the Old Testament must be wholly a search after the truth; and if reverent apprehension of the dignity of the Old Testament tradition cannot be maintained, then should the task be surrendered.

However—and therewith we come particularly to the methodical side—if one has already otherwise approached with respect and awe documents of hoary antiquity, such awe, so it seems, should be doubled and trebled in the presence of a book in which are found the records of three religions of holiness. "Take thy shoes from off thy feet, for the ground whereon thou standest is holy!" This injunction should be profoundly taken to heart by every scholar who works in the Old Testament, and also by every unlearned one who seeks to come to an understanding of it.

Had Wellhausen proceeded according to these words he had left nothing behind to reproach him. He once said: "It admits of a possibility that the law of Judaism is also the product of Judaism, not at all to be rejected, and there are strong grounds for drawing an even nearer conclusion." It is not because Wellhausen has gone against the traditional aspect of the course of Israelitish history that he is reproached, but wholly on account of the manner in which

he has done it. Had Wellhausen felt a true piety in the presence of the Old Testament Scriptures, his "Prolegomena" had carried a tone far different from that which we find in it. Confessedly, I have no comprehension of how the Old Testament science has permitted this tone to prevail without show of opposition.

From the representatives of Old Testament science before Wellhausen, so far as it was conservative, we continually learn where most to place a future blame, at least so far as they are known through their own scientific work. The conservative theologians of the middle of the nineteenth century never forgot the respect which is due to a venerable document of the past. If statements of the Old Testament contradicted, or appeared to contradict, each other, they sought for a possible agreement, and did not set forth with shears in hand to divide the record into noisy bits and scraps. Their fault stood in this, which we must, of course, extenuate, that they often provoked contradiction, because their theory of dogma did not lend itself to a severe contention, and would not chime to a false harmonistic. Doubtless, these often fell into error, but, equally without doubt, they often presented a coherency which, as can be believed, Wellhausen and his school, in haughty infatuation, light-heartedly passed by. Above all, must we in future, as we have always and everywhere done, permit the text to say to us what it will say! We can surrender of the tradition only that which is manifestly erroneous, or impossible of proof; however, not that which to us of to-day appears to be no longer convenient to retain.

Koenig once correctly remarked that it is now quite time that Old Testament theology should again be shaped from the sources; and truly must our critical judgment proceed upon the wholly safe ground of distinguishing between the proof words and the proof things. During the past ten years there has constantly come forward a type of "theological philosophy" which has more an adequate

sympathy with real philosophy and its results. Is it not astonishing, for instance, that at no time has any one from Wellhausen's side of this issue been sufficiently versed in law to give counsel in judging the problems of the Israelitish legislation? The Old Testament science of our day particularly needs a truce at this point!

This I must say: Against Wellhausen and his school we must in the future employ a critical acuteness unwonted, and must accept as our noblest objective the duty of winning a collective and consistent view of the course of Israelitish history and particularly of the history of the Israelitish religion. Meantime, with the representatives of the older conservative alignment inside the Old Testament science, we must cultivate more reverence for the sacred writings. Then indeed will our scientific labors bring results.

In the introduction to this work I remarked that in Delitzsch's literary onslaughts on the Old Testament Scriptures the contest over the said Scriptures had come to an open outbreak. Should it come to pass, through the crisis thus brought on by Delitzsch, that Old Testament science shall come more to self-consciousness, and our people be more clearly brought to the conviction that through science agreeing with religion "the unity of the Old Testament, as over against the records of all other old Oriental religions, is already clearly established, then must we rather be thankful to Delitzsch for his pamphleteering. He has, on his part, thus helped to clear us of the curse which since Wellhausen has rested on Old Testament learning, and has opened the way to a new and happier creation!

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 8

The Five Books of Moses and the Question of Their Origin

By

MAX LOEHR, D.Th., Ph.D.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1924

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 7.—"Away from Wellhausen," by Martin Kegel, Lic.Thl., Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 8.—"The Five Books of Moses and the Question of Their Origin," by Max Loehr, D.Th., Ph.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Koenigsberg, Prussia. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 9.—"The Law and the Prophets," by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER EIGHT.

The Five Books of Moses and the Question of Their Origin.

BY MAX LOEHR, D.TH., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF KOENIGSBERG, PRUSSIA.

With Introduction by the Editor.

VIII.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following contribution of Professor Loehr to the "Aftermath Series" is of unusual significance in the history of present-day Bible criticism; not only because of its scholarly and incisive character, but also because of a personal element of which it becomes the expositive. Prof. Dr. Max Loehr, who is one of the great scholars and masters of Germany, as his writings and his long-maintained position as professor of theology at the University of Koenigsberg amply testify, was, up to a brief while ago, an adherent and supporter of the Wellhausen school of Biblical higher criticism. Perhaps the adhesion of no other living German scholar has given more confidence to that school. But after a careful review of the scientific and interpretational grounds on which the Wellhausen hypothesis rests, and through the informing influence of the life and thought attitudes which have come as an *aftermath* of world war, he has been led to return to a belief in the major points of the traditional view of the Old Testament Scriptures. This restored view, as he shows, involves the primacy and authorship of Moses in the Pentateuch, the traditional order of Israelitish history, and the integrity of the claims made for the ancient institutions of the peculiar people, as set forth in their sacred books.

This brochure—"The Five Books of Moses"—is the first important printed utterance of Professor Loehr's since his desertion of the Wellhausen school. It was especially prepared at the request of the Editor for this Series. It will also soon appear in a German edition on the Continent. In this brochure our readers will find a certain indication and prophecy of reinspirited and reorganized

conservative thought. As Dr. Kegel, Professor Sellin, and Mr. Wiener, who have gone before in this Series, have shown, the exact lines of the new, or restored, interpretation have not yet been completely fixed. Only this is certain—namely, these lines will everywhere take the ground of reverence, accepting the Scriptures for what they claim to be, a valid history of God's dealings with his chosen people, and of the completion of his self-revelation to men.

It is impossible that religious thought should ever go back to the rigid and mechanical view of Bible history and revelation held a century ago; but faith in their reality and inspiration will be none the less genuine; the early legal and historical books of Israel will be none the less the work of Moses, as the New Testament writers assert; the prophets will retain their order as the inspired successors of the law, and the whole history, from beginning to end, will stand in its own completeness.

With some slight reservation, it may be said that in Professor Loehr's brochure we have the most certain outline that conservative Old Testament interpretation has yet suggested. Professor Loehr has at least laid down the main sections of a defensible foundation. Perhaps it will be well here to state categorically the conservative theory as Professor Loehr has brought us to see it.

1. The legislation of the Old Testament, in its main and fundamental elements, is rightly attributed to the authorship of Moses. There are certain questions as to methods of composition, subsequent putting together, and alignment of parts to be settled; but the main fact stands: *Moses is the author.*

2. Moses and his contemporaries were acquainted with the art of writing; and the materials for the writing of the Pentateuch, at the time and in the places claimed in the books themselves, were easily obtainable.

3. Important sections of the legal codes of the Pentateuch, including particular covenants and the legal

precepts and instructions given in the trans-Jordan region, just before the beginning of the conquest of Canaan, and which are attributed directly to the hand of Moses, are, without doubt, of Mosaic origin.

4. The history of the Israelitish priesthood, which claims Moses as its founder, is of indisputable validity, and describes a process of actual institution. No part of the higher critical reasoning is more inane than that which seeks to displace and debase the record of the priesthood.

5. The cosmological and historical materials of the book of Genesis, while no internal claim of Mosaic authorship is made, are yet of very ancient origin, and got into the Pentateuch in the same age and in the same way as did the legal sections and their complementing history.

6. The prophets followed the law, in the order in which the Bible history shows, exhibiting the ethical religion of Israel as the result of its ages of legal instruction, just as the religion of the patriarchs brought on the age of the law.

7. The Deuteronomic code, which, in one way or another, is identified by most Bible scholars with the law book found in the temple in the time of Josiah, is of ancient origin, a part, in fact, of the general Mosaic legislation. Professor Loehr does not himself identify the canonical book of Deuteronomy with the code of Josiah; but he is confident that Deuteronomy is of Mosaic origin.

8. The completely preserved laws and covenants of Moses, with their concomitant history, and the chief output of prophecy, met the new national Israel on its return from the Babylonian exile. Any theory of the exilic or postexilic origin of the law rests on nothing more serious than a scholastic guess or the necessity of a notion.

9. The purely historical books of the Old Testament, from Judges to Chronicles, and including Nehemiah and Ezra, as also the purely literary and poetic books of Job, Psalms, Canticles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Ruth, do not present any serious problems as to age of

origin and authorship. The speculative questions which they suggest are comparatively unimportant. Their value is in their intrinsic teachings. If indeed there be critical questions involving such historical books as Joshua, Judges, and Chronicles, they relate to the Pentateuchal problem and disappear with the establishment of the integrity of the Mosaic writings.

10. At the time of the return from Babylonian captivity, and, as Jewish and Christian opinion agree, under Ezra there occurred a casting together of all the ancient laws and records of Israel into what was practically the present shape of the Pentateuch, or, more properly, the Hexateuch, since the book of Joshua is adjudged to belong to this *ensemble* of ancient writings.

11. A more difficult problem for the new conservative school to settle is the extent to which the successive ages of Israelitish life and thought may have added to the Mosaic laws and records by way of interpretation, *nexi* and footnotes; or to the further end of adapting individual secular and religious statutes to the changing order of national life. In this particular department of the new conservative criticism, Professor Loehr has taken a somewhat liberal position, perhaps more liberal than some of his orthodox American readers will wholly assent to; but his views are set forth in the spirit of reverence and relate to a field of inquiry which orthodox criticism must thoroughly explore.

In setting forth his reasons for deserting the conclusions of the Wellhausen higher critical school, Professer Loehr, so far as his space permits, enters into an analysis and refutation of the points covered by the hypotheses of that school. Most of these points have already been discussed in this Series; but they are traversed by Professor Loehr in a manner so thoroughly scientific and conclusive as to give new significance to the opposition. His objections are set forth in the following order:

1. The Astruc theory of the systematic and consistent grouping of the divine appellatives, *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, in the Pentateuch, so as to indicate separate documents from which these writings were pieced together, has crumbled under scientific treatment and comparison of the various versions of the Old Testament, especially of the Greek and the Masoretic. It was mainly upon this theory of the so-called *Elohistic* and *Jahvistic* sources (E and J) that the higher critical schools from Vatke to Wellhausen were founded. Professor Loehr impressively remarks: "The chief point of the support of the Wellhausen hypothesis is the use of the names for God—Jahve and Elohim." Reviewing two lines of conservative attack on this "name" theory, he continues: "These two considerations may fully suffice to show what a frail tool in the hands of literary criticism the finger post of the name of God is. . . . In any case, we are no longer able to go to work with the names for God; but, if we go in for source criticism, we must look about for other finger posts." Thus "the chief point of support" is subtracted from the sum of destructive higher criticism.

2. The language made use of in the alleged separate sources of the Pentateuch is examined by Professor Loehr. On the theory concerning this language he caustically remarks: "We cannot spare our literary critics the reproach of having been superficial." His investigation of these "sources" leads him to say that in some passages the language is so much alike that one cannot distinguish the one from the other." In other cases the language is "very nearly related"; so that the apparent differences so much relied upon by the critics "must also be judged as unreliable." The satires of Dr. Wilson in "Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?" gather meaning at every stage of the reaction in this controversy. Professor Loehr rejects the theory of the existence of any such source writing or differentiation as a "Priest Code." This theory of a priest

writing is the chief prop of the higher critical hypothesis.

3. A third point of attack on Wellhausenism by Professor Loehr relates to the redactorial revision of the "sources." The higher criticism finds three of these redactors or editors necessary, and then a final editor, who makes free with the work of the other three. With the aid of these redactors, Wellhausen and his school have been able to do as they listed with the sacred books. Professor Loehr says concerning the supposed work of these redactors: "It is horrifying how God-forsaken these men must sometimes have been; or, to express it differently, what a want of intelligence our critics have believed them to be capable of." If a committee on "digests," appointed by Congress to deal with the laws and records of national legislation, should treat these records with the rank dishonesty with which the Wellhausen school alleges the editors of the Hebrew Scriptures dealt with those writings, it not only would be punitively corrected, but would suffer perpetual contempt in memory and in history. At this point the methods of the higher criticism become as shameless as they are reckless.

4. The Wellhausen theory of how the descriptions in the several alleged sources were put together in the Pentateuch is attacked by Professor Loehr. One can readily see that the feat ascribed to these men suggests great difficulty, so great, in fact, that it strains credulity to the point of breaking. To honest men, the task had been stupendous; to dishonest and opportunist partisans, such as the hypothesis supposes, the case is unthinkable; not, indeed, from the physical viewpoint, but from that of moral possibility, taking the Pentateuch for what it is. The reader will profitably study Professor Loehr's treatment of the case.

5. In the sphere of exegesis, the critics have been particularly lacking in insight and conscientious carefulness.

In a number of cases cited, Professor Loehr traverses this dereliction, and concludes: "Our critics are wanting in archæological knowledge and exegetical unselfishness." On the former of these two points, our readers will recall the arguments of Professor Sellin in his brochure on "Archæology versus Wellhausenism." The higher criticism is unscientific.

6. With Harold M. Wiener and others, Professor Loehr contends for a more scholarly and critical correction of the text of the Old Testament, especially of the Pentateuch, as a means of encircling not a few positions of the destructive critics. The difficulties of both the Masoretic and the Septuagint texts are well known to all students of Biblical science. It is believed that certain apparent contradictions in historical quantities and relations are due to an imperfectly transmitted text in both the Hebrew and the Greek. Professor Loehr has treated this aspect of the problem with a frankness and a freeness which indicate deep conviction as to its importance. We may differ from him as to some conclusions drawn from the present state of the text; but we cannot differ from him as to the importance of a work of text-correcting that shall leave no doubtful reading behind it. The value of his present learned discussion centers in this.

7. As a final line of attack on Wellhausenism, Professor Loehr discusses the problem of Deuteronomy. The destructive higher criticism is absolutely sure within itself that the canonical Deuteronomy was the "book of the law" which gave rise to the Reformation of Josiah. It is equally sure that this book was fabricated by Hilkiah the priest for sinister and opportunist reasons. Professor Loehr discusses the question as to whether the chance of this identity is such as to support so fateful a theory as that of Wellhausenism. Proof of the very ancient origin of Deuteronomy multiplies, while the prestige of its critics wanes.

The remaining part of this brochure deals with the personal element, to which reference was made at the opening of this Introduction—that of Professor Loehr's departure from the fellowship of the Wellhausen school of criticism. This frank, healthy, and altogether splendid admission of changed convictions on the part of a world-renowned scholar is indicative of the widening and deepening of the tides of conservative thought. A new time has come. The religious mind will not always wander in the mazes and mists of pragmatic speculation. The Word of God is light and order. An illuminated and orderly faith alone can apprehend it.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES AND THE QUESTION OF THEIR ORIGIN.

THE Five Books of Moses, or Pentateuch, constitute a unique specimen of the world's literature, not only on account of their venerable age, but, far more, on account of their peculiar contents. They reflect the long and eventful history of a people—a people of importance in the history of the world; they tell us of the childhood of this people, of its growth from youth into fully developed manhood, and all through the story may be traced the mysterious but perceptible rule of Providence. Or is it only a mere accident that the professors of the three monotheistic religions—a considerable part of humanity—venerate the characters of the Patriarchs and found their moral world of ideas on the Decalogue of Moses? Streams of religious, moral, vital strength have flowed, and are still daily flowing, from these books. Therefore it is anything but a mere phrase to say that the Pentateuch is literature of unique importance—unique in the highest sense of the word.

The systematic character of these writings has never been underestimated. The book of Genesis forms the mighty porch of the whole edifice, for in it we see how God chose from out all the nations of the earth a people—Israel—as his own peculiar people. From among the sons of men Noah was set apart, and from his sons, Shem. Then we come from Eber and Terah to Abraham, and of his two sons, Isaac is the chosen one. Of Isaac's sons, Jacob is favored, while Esau is rejected. The real father of the race, however, is Jacob. The books from Exodus to Deuteronomy are the wide and lofty halls of this building, showing how God, by his commandments, prepared his chosen people for his service. At the beginning is the

Decalogue (Ex. xx. 1–17), "Thou shalt have none other gods before me," and the conclusion forms the well-known exhortation, "Hear, O Israel: Jahve is one Lord: and thou shalt love Jahve thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." (Deut. vi. 4, 5.) The book of Joshua, in which we are told how God led his people into a land where they might live and devote themselves to the service of their God and so fulfill their mission in the history of the world, really belongs to this division of the Old Testament, and indeed, for this reason, modern science speaks of a Hexateuch instead of a Pentateuch.

Yet this gigantic edifice that one would like to think of as a cathedral towering up to heaven with its nave and many aisles, becomes a labyrinth when one takes into consideration the repetitions and lack of agreements that are undeniably contained in it.

The account of Sarah's exposure to danger in Genesis xx. is looked upon as a repetition of the same story in Genesis xii., and the expulsion of Hagar in Genesis xxi. as a repetition of her expulsion as related in Genesis xvi. Of the seeming contradictions it may suffice to point out also only a few: In the story of the creation in Genesis i. man and woman go forth from the hand of God at the same time, but in Genesis ii. the woman is not created until after the man and the beasts. According to Exodus xx. 24 one may assume that there were many altars erected to Jahve; but in Deuteronomy xii. 14 in the general judgment only one place is spoken of which Jahve will choose as the place at which he is to be worshiped. Again, according to Deuteronomy xviii., etc., all the Levites were authorized to offer sacrifices, but according to Exodus xxviii. 1 ff. only the sons of Aaron may act as priests.

Owing to all these discrepancies the learned men, one may say, of all civilized countries and in different centuries have attempted to disclose the complicated struc-

ture which may form the basis of these writings, for there is to-day not the slightest doubt that the whole represents a building to which generation after generation has added, and which from the laying of its foundation stone to its completion has taken many centuries to build.

At the same time a word may be said about the designation of these writings as "The Five Books of Moses." There are in the Old Testament a number of passages in which only the "*Law*" of Moses is spoken of, as in Ezra iii. 2 and 2 Chronicles xxxiv. 14. Philo, Josephus, the New Testament, and the Talmud go further and speak of "The Five Books of Moses," thereby extending the authorship of Moses from the Law to the whole of the five books. The Talmud, *baba bathra* 14b, remarks, however, that the last verses, describing the death of Moses, were added by Joshua. The designation, "The Five Books," therefore, cannot be literally understood—that is to say, not in the sense that Moses was the author of every word from beginning to end. Without taking into consideration that in this case he would have, as already mentioned, described his own death (in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5–12), there is not a word in Genesis about his authorship. But there are sentences and expressions which, as far as time and place are concerned, make the exclusive authorship of Moses impossible, as, for instance, in Genesis xxxvi. 31, "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel"—a sentence not to be imagined before the days of Saul, about B.C. 1050 to B.C. 1000.

Further, when in Deuteronomy i. 1 the expression "on this side Jordan" serves to designate the land of Moab, it supposes an author living in the land west of the Jordan, while Moses never came into the Promised Land at all. Therefore the designation "The Five Books of Moses" must not be taken absolutely. At the same time it contains a historical kernel. Several highly important por-

tions of the Pentateuch pertaining to law as well as to history claim to have been written by the hand of Moses. I have here noted only the following: the first Decalogue, Exodus xx.; the Book of the Covenant, Exodus xxi.–xxiii.; comp. Exodus xxiv. 4, and the so-called second Decalogue, Exodus xxxv.; comp. xxxiv. 27 f. Further the record of the encampments during the journeyings through the wilderness, Numbers xxxiii., and finally the whole legislation in the land of Moab, comp. Deuteronomy i. 5, iv. 45, xxxi. 9, 22, 24. Space does not permit me to go into the question of the authenticity of all the passages here quoted, but it is worthy of observation that scholars who recognize the Mosaic authorship of the Decalogue (Ex. xx.), as, at least, within the sphere of historical possibility, increase in number. For years I have supported the theory of the genuineness of the Decalogue and should like only to add that the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," fits into no other period of the Israelitish religious history better than at the days of the founding of the religion of Jahve, and a whole series of the remaining commandments is, as we know, through the civilization of primitive nations, as that of the old western Asia, older than Moses. As an instance of the latter's civilization we may recall a celebrated Babylonian text of exorcism in which the attacks of demons were interpreted as punishments for sins which had been committed and in which the person concerned was asked if he were guilty of sins of such a nature as described in the following:

"Had he despised father or mother?
Had he used false weights?
Had he taken possession of his neighbor's goods?
Had he approached his neighbor's wife?
Had he shed his neighbor's blood?
Had he been sincere with his mouth, but false in his heart?"

Similar thoughts are in the very ancient Egyptian Book of Death, which contains sentences to this effect:

"I have not killed.
I have not committed adultery.
I have not stolen.
I have given bread to the hungry
And water to the thirsty
And clothes to the naked."

It is only natural that Moses should also impose upon his countrymen, in the name of Jahve, such commandments as those concerning filial love, the prohibition to steal or to kill, etc.—commandments which had long been the intellectual possession of humanity. But were Moses acknowledged in this case, as in many other cases, with historical right as lawgiver, it is to be understood that later additions to, and improvements of, the old law were also attributed to him, and that he was finally looked upon as the author of the whole of the writings wherein this legislative material which, after all, we owe to him was dealt with.

It may be instructive to give with a few strokes a sketch of the ever-renewed attempts to get at the secret of the origin of the Pentateuch. The starting point is the work of a French doctor, Jean Astruc—"*Conjectures sur les memoires originaux, dont il paraît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse.*" It appeared anonymously in Brussels in the year 1753. Astruc was the first to employ the key that, according to the opinion of many—rather the most—people, opens the door to this knowledge—namely, the distinction between the names for God—Jahve and Elohim. By this he gained a Jahve document and an Elohim document—not taking into account a number—ten in all—of smaller and less important documents, and the so-called older hypothesis of documents was founded. His hypothesis was further developed by a German scholar—Karl David Ilgen, who in his book, "*Die Urkunden des jerusalemischen Tempelarchaios in ihrer Urgestalt,*" 1798, distinguishes between an older and a younger Elohim document. In this way was laid, actual-

ly more than a hundred years ago, the foundation upon which Julius Wellhausen has, in our days, continued to build. But the history of the mental progress of mankind does not run smoothly. Even Astruc with his dozen documents was obliged to admit that many were of a very fragmentary character. And of this weak point criticism laid hold. It was a Roman Catholic English theologian, Alexander Geddes, who in several books which appeared in London between 1792 and 1800 (note particularly his "Critical Remarks on the Pentateuch") analyzed the whole of the literature, separating it into a host of larger and smaller fragments, but also making use of the two names for God. The fragments are said by him to have arisen from two different sources. This so-called hypothesis of fragments met with the assent of a German theologian at the University of Halle, Johann Severin Vater, who concluded his "*Pentateuchkommentar*" in three volumes (1802–05) with a treatise on Moses and the authors of the Pentateuch written in accordance with the theories established by Geddes. This fragmentary hypothesis found, by the way, many supporters in Germany throughout several decades. But by degrees a reaction set in. The attention of the literary world was drawn to the systematic progress of the whole course of events described —especially in Genesis—and the supposition of incoherent fragments was replaced by the hypothesis that a compiler of the existing tradition-material systematically supplemented it by additions of his own. The originator of this hypothesis of supplements was the well-known Göttingen theologian Heinrich Ewald with his book "*Die Komposition der Genesis kritisch untersuchs,*" 1823. From the two elements—namely, that of systematic arrangement and that of literary materials of various origin—the new documentary hypothesis was formed. Its home is Germany, its originator Hermann Hupfeld, a professor of theology in Halle, who in 1853 published a book with the

title, "*Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung, von neuem untersucht.*" According to it, a redactor had combined three independent sources—namely, the Jahvist and an older and a younger Elohist. On this foundation rests the work of Julius Wellhausen, "*Die Komposition des Hexateuchs*," which first appeared in the "*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*," 1876 and 1877; and then afterwards independently—going through three editions—in 1899. Through the work of Wellhausen this hypothesis has gradually met with such extensive acceptance, not only in Germany but in Holland, and in the countries where the English language is spoken, that, setting aside slight modifications, it may be considered predominant. As it has become popular through Wellhausen, it is generally named after him, although he may more correctly be called the most successful promulgator, than the real inventor, of this hyposthesis. The men of letters too, whose observations are made from the same point of view, are not disciples of Wellhausen in the true sense of the word, but frequently opponents who have become adherents of the Wellhausen solution of the Pentateuch problem. They have by their literary contributions helped to shape and to establish the whole hypothesis more firmly, so that to-day the results may be summed up as follows: The book of Joshua, according to its form and contents, belongs to the Pentateuch, so that, to be really correct, we should speak of a Hexateuch and not of a Pentateuch problem. This Hexateuch literature, according to this theory, is made up of four independent sources, J, E, D, P, the oldest of them being that of the Jahvist (J). It originated in Judah and before the time of the literary-productive prophets and is made up of several recensions. About a century younger than the Jahvist is that of the Elohist (E), written in Northern Israel, not as a connected whole, and reëdited by a later hand. J and E were combined by a redactor (R). The

main point of the whole hypothesis is D, the so-called "*Urdeuteronomium*"—*i. e.*, the original Deuteronomy, or, in other terms, the "Book of the Law"—in Hebrew, *sefer hattora*. It was found, according to the account given in 2 Kings xxii., in the year B.C. 621, during the reign of Josiah in the Temple at Jerusalem. We have this original D in several editions, and it has been likewise combined with J E by a redactorial hand. Then about the year B.C. 500 there originated, amongst the community of Jewish exiles in Babylon, a fourth source—a historical legislative work—the Priestly Code (P). As it makes use of the name Elohim for God, it has been also called the younger Elohist. This Priestly Code is the Book of the Law of Moses or God and was brought, about B.C. 450, by Ezra to Jerusalem that he might with its help take up his reformatory work in the community there. This Priestly Code likewise exhibits no particular system in its compilation, but has been repeatedly revised. Finally in Jerusalem it was combined with J, E, D.

Sellin in his "*Einleitung ins Alt Testament*" states as follows: "Ezra in Jerusalem was soon obliged to admit that, in spite of his unlimited power, an introduction of the Priestly Code at the expense of the older laws was impossible. He was consequently obliged to combine the former with the latter—in other terms, our Pentateuch is the work of him and his assistants."

Against this point of view, which forms the basis of the Wellhausen hypothesis, renewed attacks have been made and they are based upon absolutely scientific foundations, but for the most part little notice has been taken of them. In scientific matters, however, there are unfortunately prejudices whose obstinacy is in no wise inferior to that in other fields of thought. These attacks have not, therefore, been able to attain any real success. So much, at least, may be maintained, that the doubts with regard to the Wellhausen standpoint continue to grow stronger and

more numerous and that the desire for a thorough revision of the whole hypothesis is shared by many who even to-day, for want of better, go to work with the stock phrases of this hypothesis. In Germany, the native soil of Wellhausenism, August Klostermann has expressed his reflections in a series of treatises which were published together in book form in 1893 under the title, "*Der Pentateuch, Beitrage zu seinem Verstandnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte.*" B. D. Erdmans followed him with a series of researches written in the German language entitled "*Alttestamentliche Studien,*" i.–iv., 1908–12. And finally may Johannes Dahse's "*Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage,*" i., 1912, be mentioned here as well as a number of occasional publications expressing objections. Harold M. Wiener, an Englishman, is an indefatigable combatant against Wellhausen. Besides his "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," 1910, his collection "Pentateuchal Studies," 1912, and his book, "The Origin of the Pentateuch"—translated into German by Dahse—may be here mentioned. As well as these there exist a number of important special researches which for the most part have been published in the American periodical *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

What are the points of attack from which the controversy of the above-mentioned men of letters is carried on? They are naturally identical with the principal points of support of the whole hypothesis. One of these—or rather, *the* chief point of support—is the use of the names for God—Jahve and Elohim. Concerning these two modes of expression Klostermann and then again Dahse have compared the Hebrew text with that of the Greek translation of the Old Testament and with the Samaritan text, and numerous divergences have come to light thereby. These divergences, however, provide irrefutable proof of a decided inexactness in the handing-down of the names for God. Then there is another difficult point. It is to-day

admitted without hesitation even by the advocates of the Wellhausen theory, that here and there in the Masoretic text a *Jahve* or an *Elohim* may have come from the hand of a redactor; as, for instance, in Genesis xvii. 1, xxviii. 18, xxxi. 49. These two considerations may fully suffice to make clear what a very frail tool in the hands of literary criticism the finger post of the names for God is. If an uncertainty of transmission is proved in *one* passage, then the certainty of all other passages is called into question. This rule—which is, for instance, applied to the headings of the Psalms, without further consideration—is here not recognized as correct. Besides this, in consideration of the present-day documentary hypothesis, all sources must, at least according to Exodus vi. 3 ff., make use of Jahve as the name for God. This is, however, not the case, as numerous other passages in Exodus and Numbers prove: Exodus xiii. 17 ff., xviii. 1 ff., xix. 17 ff.; Numbers xxi. 5, xxii. 9 ff., xxiii. 4. In any case we are no longer able to go to work with the names for God, but—if we go in for source-criticism—we must look about for other finger posts.

The advocates of the Wellhausen theory universally recommend as such the language made use of by the sources and they apply this test very energetically. As far as this is concerned, we cannot, in my opinion, spare our literary critics the reproach of having been very superficial. The Priestly Code is acknowledged as the one most plainly to be recognized by its language. But, first, Erdmans has already proved that not by any means all the words which are looked upon as the special property of the Priestly Code are to be found in it exclusively. Secondly, if such an expression as "Land of Canaan" is found in a verse or part of a verse no one has at once tried to find out whether this expression, in the passage in question, be one of the chance marginal notes or the elucidating interpolation of a copyist; as, for instance, in Genesis

xxxiii. 18, xxxv. 6, and in other places. On the contrary, it is assigned at once to the P, and no consideration whatever is given to the question as to how the verse or part of the verse has come into the context. Just this question of the revision of our Hebrew text, or, speaking from another standpoint, the question as to the genuine form of the text of the Pentateuch, is of such vital importance that on going through the critical investigations which are founded on the Wellhausen theory, one asks in astonishment how it is possible that this primary and indispensable task should have been passed over without further consideration. This error was first pointed out by Harold M. Wiener and we owe him unreserved gratitude for it and for having discussed just this problem in two most instructive treatises which appeared in the April, 1918, and the July, 1920, numbers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. He says: "The great majority of Old Testament students have been content to rely in the main on our present Hebrew, the Masoretic text, abandoning its readings only when practically compelled to do so. . . . The only possible basis for really scientific work is a critical text, and the dominant principle to be observed in the formation of such a text is so simple that everybody can grasp it. The function of scientific textual criticism is to recover that text from which all our existing evidence has been derived." As regards the language of the remaining sources J, E, D, it is in part openly admitted and in part it follows with most desirable clearness in the hitherto existing scientific dissertations, first, that J and E are in some passages so much alike in language that one cannot distinguish one from the other; secondly, that E and D are, concerning their language, very nearly related. Therefore the finger post of the language used must also be judged as unreliable. There exists, by the way, no agreement amongst scholars about this means of criticism and its value. To say nothing of the stock of words contained

in it, we find in the Pentateuch more than one name given to the same person, as when, for instance, Moses's father-in-law is called Hobab or Jethro, when the mountain of legislature is called Sinai or Horeb; when the people who dwelt in the Promised Land before the Israelites are called Amorites or Canaanites, etc. These differences may perhaps signify that the traditions in question originated in different districts—we know that the people of Israel were descended from Leah and Rachel—and were a mixture of North and South country people, but there is no sufficient reason in this fact for the theory of different independent sources.

A third point of attack is the redactorial revision, not only of the sources J, E, D, P, together, but also of the revision of each separate source. First, the revision of the sources together—three editors and a final editor are necessary. It is horrifying how God-forsaken these men must sometimes have been or, to express it differently, what a want of intelligence our critics have believed them to be capable of. For instance, they say of Genesis xix. 29 that this verse, which belongs to the Priestly Code, suddenly appears in the middle of Jahve's context. The only reason for attributing it to the Priestly Code is the language and the mode of naming God—namely, the two phrases "cities of the plain" and "Elohim remembered." No one troubles further about the contents of the verse, but passes over, in this way, the difficulty of the whole situation. Genesis xix. 29 says, namely, that at the destruction of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah God saved Lot out of consideration for Abraham. And this information is given after a detailed description of Lot and his family's deliverance has already been given (verses 1–16). One cannot understand why the redactor should have repeated what was well enough known to the readers. After the fate of the cities was finally sealed and minutely described (verses 23–28) what interest could he have taken in once

more repeating, "but Lot was saved"? The problem —*i. e.*, the presence of this verse in this place—is not to be solved in this manner. I cannot here go too deeply into exegetic details, and therefore refer for the solving of the problem to a treatise on Genesis xviii., xix., and especially on this verse, by Ivan Eve Gillischewski in "*Zeitschrift für alttestament. Wissenschaft*," 1923. In connection with this passage I must draw attention to a further difficulty. What is to be thought of the way the redactors have worked at all, and especially in the insertion of such separate verses? There are a host of places where suddenly, in the midst of a longer connected passage, a detached verse or part of a verse, from another source, is said to be inserted. I mention as characteristic Genesis xxix. 24 and 29, and for parts of a verse xxi. 1*a* or 1*b*. Did the redactor in such a case, like an artist taking his shades of color from his palette, suddenly feel an inclination to insert an element from the source-document that lay before him? Our critics pass over such questions of detail in silence. Further, the origin of the separate sources forms more than one recension. Our sources, J, E, D, P, are said to be scarcely any of them uniform literary productions. On the contrary, each is said to be composed of several recensions. For instance, one supposes a double recension of J—J1 and J2—that have been combined by a redactor as J. With E opinions are divided as to whether several recensions are to be supposed. The combining of D with J E is again complicated. Many are inclined to suppose two different editions of J, E, D. In the Priestly Code, too, a distinction is made between different elements—P(g), P(h), P(s); that is, the fundamental document, called in German "*Grundschrift* (g)," procured by Ezra and read aloud by him to the community (cf. Neh. viii.–x.); then the so-called Law of Holiness (h), Leviticus xvi.–xxv.; and finally all sorts of supplements (s). Through the integration of the source-documents, the documentary

hypothesis has been, as many admit, put on one side, and many scholars are returning to the fragmentary hypothesis.

To this critical point may be attached another difficulty, and that is the question of the connection in the description of the separate sources and that of their omissions. If one considers, for example, the Priestly Code, its narrative in Genesis is in part so abundant that the Jahvist material only serves to fill up the gaps, as in the description of the Flood, Genesis vi.–ix.; in the genealogical table, Genesis x.; and in Abram's departure out of the land of Haran into Canaan, Genesis xi. 27–xii. 6*a*. In this last passage we have clearly a complete and connected whole, and in the passage xii. 1–4*a*, which is called Jahvist, is an insertion given as a motive for Abram's leaving Haran. For long stretches at a time, however, P quite disappears, or almost quite, especially in the story of Jacob and Laban and in the story of Joseph. In the former description P is said to offer the following material (xxix. 24, 28*b*, 29): "And Laban gave unto his daughter Leah Zilpah his maid for an handmaid. And he gave him Rachel his daughter to wife also. And Laban gave to Rachel his daughter Bilhah his handmaid to be her maid." Again (xxxv. 22), "The sons of Jacob were twelve;" and xxxi. 18, "And he carried away all his cattle . . . for to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan." In itself the whole is abstruse. It is, it is said, only selected in this way by the redactor. One makes the redactors responsible for these conspicuous phenomena without troubling one's head further about the difference in the choice of material even where, as is often the case, sentences have been taken out of an otherwise fairly connected passage. If J is the oldest source and in combination with E and D certainly forms the literary groundwork for the whole, it appears, for all that, very remarkable that in many places the Priestly Code, which to the critics is only a historical

compendium, has so much to say that J, the original and oldest essential part, appears to be only material for stopping up the gaps. Here again is certainly a problem regarding the redactorial treatment of the sources of which from the point of view of to-day no notice is taken.

A further point of attack is to be found in the exegetic sphere. Here I must take great care not to fall into the danger of going too much into detail. Nevertheless I cannot omit to offer a few excellent examples by which may be seen how closely a right understanding of the separate factors is connected with the judgment of the whole. In Genesis xiii., the story of Lot's separation from Abraham—a story, by the way, that, like a great many in the book of Genesis, bears a completely profane character—verse 6 is, in the first place, assigned to two sources, J and P. The sentence "and the land was not able to bear them, that they might dwell together," and the other, "for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together," are supposed not to have come from the same hand. Compare xxxvi. 7, where it says, "For their riches were more than that they might dwell together; and the land wherein they were strangers could not bear them because of their cattle." There the same thought is expressed twice, but a twofold source is not taken into consideration. In other books, too, of the Old Testament this is not the case either; compare, for instance, the sentences in Isaiah lvi. 5: "Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off." Does the double "dwell together" strike us as odd, we must take into consideration the Oriental way of story-telling. A further difficulty to our critics is found in Genesis xiii. 11 f. Here they state that verse 11*b* comes limping after verse 11. Verse 11*b* is rather the conclusion of the narrative, for after it has been said that "Lot chose him all the plain

of Jordan. and Lot journeyed east," it says in conclusion, "and they separated themselves one from the other." In my opinion these objections are quite as groundless as those made against verse 12. After it has been said that "Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan," it says of Lot that he "dwelt in the cities of the plain and pitched his tent toward Sodom." "Pitched his tent" does not mean here his "journeying," while his settling in the cities has already been spoken of. It is not as if the whole matter were turned upside down and the mistake only to be rectified by finding a double source. On the contrary, that a right understanding is wanting is a result of the ignorance of the critics. Lot is a half nomad who during the grazing season of the year pitches his tent with his cattle in the pastures—"pitched his tent toward Sodom"—and in the rainy season seeks shelter with his flocks in one of the cities of the plain of Jordan which is his pasture-land district. We meet a similar ignorance of realities in connection with chapter xlvi. 5. Here verse 1, "Israel took his journey . . . and came to Beersheba," is allotted to a different source than verse 5, where it is said that the old father and all the women and children were put into the wagons that Pharaoh had sent to take them to Egypt. The departure from Beersheba is supposed to imply that they had dwelt there. But their not having made use of the wagons until Beersheba is no proof at all of Israel's having lived there. They certainly could not have used them before, for the steep mountains north of Beersheba are quite impassable for wagons. Such examples are numerous. Our critics are wanting in archæological knowledge—some think it contemptuous—and in exegetical unselfishness or exegetical tact.

Lastly it has, in these days, become questionable whether we really possess in the canonical Deuteronomy the "Book of the Law" which served as the instrument of Josiah's reform. The problem of Deuteronomy has never

been finally solved. Voices continue to be heard raising doubts as to the identity of the canonical Deuteronomy—or parts of it—with the "Book of the Law"—which was discovered in the reign of Josiah. Quite lately these voices have considerably increased. Martin Kegel published in 1919 his researches entitled "*Die Kultusreformation des Josia*" in which he points out as probable that, as well as parts of Deuteronomy, sections of the Priestly Code have belonged to the Book of the Law. In the year 1920 appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and afterwards independently a treatise by Harold M. Wiener, "The Main Problem of Deuteronomy," in which he chiefly tries to prove the authenticity of the Mosaic speeches. Lastly Gustav Holscher in "*Zeitschrift fur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*," 1922, raised an objection to the identification of the Book of the Law with a part of Deuteronomy. He thinks our Deuteronomy was written in Babylon about B.C. 500 as a legislative attempt to reorganize the affairs of the community at Jerusalem. How far these works and their authors have cleared up the problem I will not here inquire into. So much is certain that the so-called "firm point" of the Wellhausen hypothesis is no longer a firm point.

Literature as complicated as the Pentateuch or Hexateuch is certainly only to be explained by a complicated development. In my opinion, however—to begin at once with my principle of explanation—we must not go to work with sources which, after showing more or fewer exterior signs of recognition, are rejected and are therefore of only uncertain magnitude. The Pentateuch is a reflection of the whole intellectual life of Israel, and therefore in dealing with these scriptures we shall have to inquire rather into the elements of the history of the nation's literature—elements which, in the course of centuries and centuries of Israelitish intellectual life, have been united in a way seldom easy for us to recognize. This way of inquiry is shown by Hermann Gunkel in his commentary on Gen-

esis, 1901. Only in one case are we able with some certainty to throw light upon this process of gradual crystallization. We mostly grope in the dark. In any case we must beware of the productions of weak-minded, forgetful, and otherwise mentally defective redactors. It is really a simple law of humanity to assume that men like Ezra, for example, knew exactly what they wanted and could dispose of their five healthy senses in order to strive after their own aims. Perhaps we do not always understand them, because the necessary knowledge of particulars is wanting. That is to be excused, but the inclination which prevails at present of feigning a redactor who is supposed to be guilty of the greatest follies is not to be excused.

We must therefore now cast a glance at the intellectual life of Israel. But the intellectual life of Israel, so far as it has been fixed in literary productions and in this way been made accessible to us, is traceable down to its earliest beginnings. As a matter of course, the literary fixative-process is preceded by a period of exclusively oral tradition. One must not, however, imagine that Israel's nomadic forefathers and their kindred were without intellectual life. These people, sitting in the evening by their watchfire, knew how to tell stories, recite poems, and tell riddles exactly as the wandering tribes of Arabia in the country east of Jordan or on the shores of the Dead Sea are in the habit of doing to-day. And from this time of Israel and its people's childhood many of these stories and songs have come down to us. For instance, that of how Hagar, the ancestress of the Ishmaelites, heavy with child, meets at a fountain in the wilderness the demon (spirit) of the place and he tells her, "Thou shalt bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Ishmael, . . . and he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him." (Gen. xvi. 7, 11 f.) Of this story we have a variation (Gen. xxi. 14 ff.) in which the want and

despair of the mother who, with her infant son, had lost her way in the wilderness are touchingly described. The mother lays her child—thirsty and nearly dying—under a bush and sits down a little way off, weeping and in despair; she cannot sit by and see her child die. But God hears her weeping and opens her eyes and she sees a well of water, gives the child a drink, and so restores him to life. We have in Genesis xix. a story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, a tradition from the earliest prehistorical times. It was certainly a long time of development of this story on an event—doubtless historical—from its oldest form, when it was handed down orally from generation to generation, to the time when it was produced in writing in Genesis in an artistic form, with a moral tendency and in connection with Abraham and Lot; and there are surely not many readers to whom the nineteenth chapter of Genesis affords edification, who could picture to themselves this long and complicated process of literary development.

We have already mentioned how Ishmael and his descendants, the Bedouin tribes of North Arabia, were characterized as wild men untamed and untamable. In the same manner many of the tribes of Israel were given a sort of phrase which was an attempt to show their special characteristic in the right light. Sometimes the phrase was adopted by themselves, if they were proud of any special characteristic, sometimes invented by others. So of Dan it is said (Gen. xlix. 17), "Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse-heels, so that his rider shall fall backward"; of Benjamin (Gen. xlix. 27), "Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf: in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil;" and of Judah (Gen. xlix. 9), "Judah is a lion's whelp; . . . he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up?" It is, up to this day, an unforgotten triumph of Israel's—as of

Israel's God, who was exalted in ancient, so-called "women's poetry," that (Ex. xv. 21) Miriam and the other women, beating their timbrels and dancing, took up the song, "Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea." A very old song and not less nature-like is the well-known song of Lamech (Gen. iv. 23), who glorifies the avenging of blood: "Hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt."

Apart from the fact that these songs and sayings reflect an unquenched fire and native characteristic that must have been peculiar to the forefathers of Israel, they are, like the above-mentioned stories, the oldest forms of which the literature of the Pentateuch is built, and by means of literary-historical methods we are able to lift them out of the whole structure in their antiquity and originality. As a matter of course, the life of people in a peaceful state was also the subject of poetic glorification. Love, marriage, birth, and death were not passed over in silence. It is not, however, in the Pentateuch, but in the so-called Song of Solomon, that we have a collection of secular love-songs, whose unrestrained nature character tells of great antiquity and of a people living under primitive conditions; for instance, Song of Solomon vi. 5 ff., where the beauty of the beloved is described, "Turn away thine eyes from me, for they have overcome me: thy hair is as a flock of goats that appear from Gilead. Thy teeth are as a flock of sheep which go up from the washing, . . . as a piece of a promegranate are thy temples within thy locks." The bride in leaving her parents' house was accompanied by song. Such a song is preserved to us in Genesis xxiv. 60: "Thou art our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them." With what joy the birth of a son was greeted by the men may be seen from Jeremiah

xx. 15, and how affecting was the women's bewailing of the dead in Jeremiah ix. 19; but we have in these two cases no detailed evidences of authenticity. Finally there is no doubt that in the province of profane and sacred rights certain rules had been formulated and had at first been passed on orally from generation to generation, but they are not so easy to authenticate as the songs and sayings above. Nevertheless there are tracks that may be followed. Jacob complains in Genesis xxxi. 39 of his hard master Laban, to whom he was liable to compensation for every head of cattle that was missing either through beasts of prey or thieves, whether stolen by day or night. An old legal conception known to us from ancient western Asia lies as the foundation of Jacob's grievance. The shepherd is responsible to his master for every single sheep of the flock, and, as one sees here, this rule could be carried out by the master now leniently, now severely. Laban was, according to Jacob's opinion, unrelenting in his legal claims. Another instance concerns life in the home. The handmaid of a married woman such as Hagar, is her—the married woman's—exclusive property. The husband has no right to any claims on her, except with the express approval of his wife. Compare Genesis xvi. 1 ff. and xxx. 3, 9. This legal point of view is also, through other accounts, proved to be very ancient. Concerning laws of a sacred nature, I may point out an old rule for circumcision, which is contained in the present text of Genesis xvii. 10*b*–12 and which perhaps ran as follows: "Circumcised among you shall be all that is male."

Such intellectual possession in the different provinces of life was at first only handed down orally until the art of writing and reading was acquired. When that happened in Israel we do not know. Yet we may assume that the art of writing was widely practiced in the ancient Orient as early as three thousand years before Christ, consequently it is taken as a matter of course in the Old Testament

that Moses was acquainted with the art. Before, however, the so-called days of the patriarchs, the art of writing is not mentioned, and we cannot discern from the words of Genesis xxxviii. 18 whether the patriarch Judah's signet was covered with a picture or words, but after Moses the art of reading and writing in Israel continued to spread extensively. From Judges viii. 14 we learn that a young man amongst the burghers of Succoth wrote a list of the names of the inhabitants of this town. Since David's time the educated Israelite at least possessed the facility to write and read (cf. 2 Sam. xi. 14, 1 Kings xxi. 8). At the Israelitish king's court there was a scribe as there had already been for centuries at the king's court of the Canaanites; and though it is not expressly said, it is doubtless certain that the priests in the sanctuaries could read and write; in other words, that they started and kept up Temple archives, collections of rules for ritual, books about the Temple revenue, and the like. In the middle of the time of the kings there presumably existed in Jerusalem writing schools for children (Isa. x. 19). Besides the illiterate, of whom there naturally were some, the number of those acquainted with the art of writing was so large that Isaiah had one of his oracles, which was written on a tablet, exhibited in public so that the passers-by might read it. (Isa. viii. 1.) In what alphabetical characters the Israelites at first wrote is a question which, not without some probability, has been answered by several scholars to the effect that wedge-characters were at first used. That these characters were prevalent at least in Palestine about the middle of the second millennium B.C. we know exactly, and they were to be met with there down to the seventh century B.C. On the other hand, since we know the inscriptions of the Sinai-peninsula from the time of the Hyksos—and the Hyksos, according to the most recent researches, are certainly related to the forefathers of the Israelites—there exists a possibility that from the

beginning ancient Israel made use of alphabetical characters which had their origin in hieroglyphics, and it is to be thought are very nearly related to the inscriptions of King Mesha of Moab, or those of Ostraka of Sebastia, or the Siloah inscriptions, or, lastly, the Calendars of Geser, to name only the most important documents.

We do not here intend to treat the whole archæology of the Hebrew art of writing, as, for instance, the question of its development, its working-materials, and the like. The art of working interests us here only in so far as it may be considered a means of expression of intellectual life. In respect to this, what we have said above will make clear to the reader that the early and uncommon spread of the art bears unquestionable testimony to the active intellectual life of the ancient Israelites.

In fact, not only from the whole of the Old Testament, but especially from the Pentateuchal literature a considerable number of examples may be produced. We may change the words of Ecclesiastes xii. 12, "Of making many books there is no end," with reference to preëxilic times in so far as to say "Of writing there was no end."

Before going on, a few general points of view must be stated. We must distinguish between a productive activity in prose and poetry and an activity in collecting. In this latter activity a learned interest is at play, and we can verify its existence in fairly ancient times. Concerning literary productions, there are threefold observations to be made. These productions are of course materially stimulated and enriched by Canaanitish mental culture, so that we must always keep before us the fact that the intellectual treasures of the Old Testament represent a mixture of Israelitish and Canaanitish elements. Canaanitish matter and Israelitish intellect have here united, and this synthesis has brought about in not a few cases an enrichment in the Jahve religion. We must realize further that Israel's literary productions originated in various

places—in the Southern Kingdom as well as in the Northern. The result of this was no little variety in the productions, for, in spite of their near relationship, the tribes of Leah and Rachel, as far as character and habit of life were concerned, were of a very different nature. We may even assume divergent usages and rites in the different sanctuaries; for instance, in Jerusalem they would be different from those in Bethel and Dan. Finally the circles amongst which the productions originated were in no way always the same. Just as the traditions now mentioned were affected by locality, so would the same changes be brought about by different people. We should chiefly like to give prominence to three different circles—the court and the heads of the aristocratic families and the official nobility; then the priestly and learned circles; and lastly the prophets and men of God—the zealous adherents of the Jahve religion who essentially sprang from amongst the people. Beside the purely literary productions of the three above-mentioned circles there flowed along, side by side with them, a current of illiterate, popular production that was for the most part of a purely profane character.

In order to gain after these remarks a general view of the matter of the literary productions, I should like to begin with a kind that appears to me very dry and tedious, but that in the whole of the ancient Orient and not least so in Israel, played a prominent part—that is, the genealogical schemes. Understanding for, or appreciation of, the idea that the different members of a family belong to one another is a virtue which, to this day, is strongly developed amongst the Jews, and it was not otherwise in the dawn of history. We may assume that there existed amongst the families and kinsfolk at first only an oral tradition depending exclusively on memory, but that this tradition was one day fixed in writing and continued with accuracy. Of such purely family chronicles we have, of course, nothing more in Genesis. These literary kinds of genealogical

schemes that were at first familiar only to the family and tribe, gradually established a means of ethnological and political relationship between the nations and tribes; the mode of sonship, legitimate or illegitimate, was made use of as the outward form for such relationship. In this way, for instance, a relationship between Israel and Edom—Jacob and Esau were brothers of the same mother—is proved, and the evidence must rest upon very ancient tradition. For after David's time a relationship between Israel and the obnoxious Edom would never have been discovered. In the same way one may judge of the relationship between Israel and Ishmael and between Moab and Ammon. There may have been here and there misstatements in these genealogies in Genesis, but the argument that they are, all taken together, later inventions will not carry weight to-day. It being frankly admitted that the tribe of Judah is strongly mixed with Canaanitish blood (Gen. xxxviii. 1 f.) speaks also for the faithfulness of such traditions. When in Genesis xxxv. 23 ff. the twelve sons of Jacob are enumerated and their descent from both the wives and both the concubines is given there lies as the basis of this enumeration a decidedly political estimate of the separate tribes of Israel, whereby the whole is, at the same time, brought together in a systematic, artistic form —the duodecimal. This genealogical scheme is, however, made use of in Genesis in another direction—in, so to say, a learned direction. The genealogical table in Genesis x. attempts to give names to all the nations of the earth and does this by representing these nations as one large family —the descendants of Noah. Beside this great special commonwealth, an immense space of time is also brought into a genealogical system. The time from the Creation to the Flood is filled up in Genesis by the so-called list of the Sethites (Gen. v. 3–32). From Adam to Noah runs an unbroken chain of ten generations which are each time represented by a father of the tribe

If it follows from what we have said up to now that, under the cloak of a literary, artistic form that perhaps appears childlike to us, many valuable historical reminiscences are concealed, it is still more so the case with the accounts of really historical events such as the Pentateuchal literature hands down. I am thinking thereby, in the first place, of the account of the journeyings of the patriarchs from Mesopotamia to Canaan and from there to Egypt. These journeyings are not at all to be interpreted as the wanderings of cattle-breeding nomads from one pasture-ground to the other, but they are parts of a great historical period. The stupendous migrations of peoples, which took place in western Asia in the second millennium B.C. and of which we know to-day at best in its outlines, serves as the background for the journeyings of the patriarchs. The advance of the Hittites from Asia Minor to the country of the twin rivers as to Syria and Palestine, the invasion of the Hyksos into Egypt are events the reflection of which is preserved to us in the Pentateuchal literature in the shape of the family histories of Abraham and Jacob. The same (naturally relative) historical value must be granted to the Biblical narrative of Israel's exodus from the land of Egypt. The fight of Israel with Amalek, the favorable result of which even Moses in Exodus xvii. 14 ff. gives a written account; the sojourn of the children of Israel in Kadesh and the opposition which arose there of the Reubenites against Moses; the invasion of Israelitish tribes under Joshua, from the East into the land of Canaan—to select only these three events—are again occurrences the historical authenticity of which cannot—at least in the main substance—be called into question. Certainly the accounts which we have of these things are not in the form of strictly historical descriptions, but are a legendary, touched-up representation, the single parts of which have undergone repeated revisions or are so over-full of detail that from time to time the original

contents can only be recognized with great trouble and in outline. To the divers disarrangements which the original narrative has suffered belongs, for example, a later theological revision of the original popular oral tradition. Marks of this theological-political revision are, for example, the promises to the patriarchs that the land of Canaan should belong to them and their children. (Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 15; xv. 7, 18; xvii. 8; xxviii. 4, 13; xxxv. 12; xlviii. 4.) But, leaving these theological-political revisions out of the question, a purely literary revision of parts of the material has ensued and has been combined into separate complexes.

The men who undertook such literary work were, as was the case with nearly all the ancient nations, in the first place, the priests. Their theological-political interests, their education, their mental qualities altogether led them to such occupations. But it is not only to the priestly circles in Israel that we owe thanks for the elements of the Pentateuchal literature. We have descriptions (Gen. ii., iii.) such as the highly poetical, religiously moral, and deeply serious story of Paradise and the Fall, or (Gen. xxiii.) the purely secular story of how Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah from the Hittites, that we could not without repugnance assign to the pen of a priest. I am inclined to assume, even at such a relatively early date, a class of mental workers with whom we meet later on, in the seventh century B.C. at the time of the prophet Jeremiah and who, during and after the exile, played a prodigious part in Judaism—namely, the Scribes. Such it may have been who collected the popular old reminiscences and systematically revised them. But they are sure to have treated other themes with which, in their contact with the culture of western Asia, they had become acquainted. I mean, for instance, the subject of the beginning of the world and that of the Flood, which latter theme originated in the flood-district of the Euphrates and Tigris.

The story of Paradise is also to be mentioned again here; and in conclusion we must mention the story of the tower of Babel, whose once polytheistic-character the Biblical representation only very superficially strips off.

Beside the priests and scribes we must assume still a third kind of mental-workers whose activity is likewise traceable in the Pentateuch—the jurists or those learned in the law. We have in the Pentateuch a large and varied collection of laws of a profane as well as of a sacred character. Jeremiah (viii. 8) complains of the disastrous overoccupation of the lawyers, and Isaiah (x. 1 ff.) speaks of the people who draw up unrighteous statutes and continually write oppressive decrees. The oldest chronicle we have of chiefly secular law is the so-called Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxi.–xxiii.), while the oldest priestly lawbook is the so-called second Decalogue (Ex. xxxiv. 14–26). All provinces of life, public and private, of peace and war, of the family and its members, of male and female slaves, debt-laws, marriage-laws, laws of inheritance, and criminal laws are all dealt with by these lawyers, and we find a more or less detailed codification of their ordinances in the legal sections of the Pentateuch. To leave the second Decalogue out of the question we have detailed instructions about the execution of the separate kinds of sacrifice, lists of ritually prohibited animals, calendars of feast-days, and much else. These instructions are only inexact in so far as we seldom learn who shall decide and how the decision is to be brought about. But we have not yet exhausted the contents of the Pentateuch. The poetical sections which are here and there inserted are still to be discussed. We know that the custom of making collections of poetry began at a very early date. We know two such collections and they are both mentioned in the Hexateuch—namely, the Book of the Wars of the Lord and the Book of Jasher (or the Book of Songs—the handing down of the name varies). Unfortunately from one of the collec-

tions we have only one quotation which, owing to its brevity, is difficult to understand; namely, Numbers xxi. 14 f. is out of the Book of the Wars of the Lord. The other quotation, the well-known saying of Joshua, is out of the Book of Jasher: "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon." (Joshua x. 12–14.) In addition to these collections there are still others of greater size. As a proof of the existence of such collections a remark in Proverbs xxv. 1 is of importance. It says that Hezekiah, king of Judah, a contemporary of Isaiah, had the proverbs of Solomon collected by one of his learned men. Of like collections we have altogether three in the Pentateuch—viz., the so-called Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.); the Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii.); the Sayings of Balaam (Num. xxiii.–xxiv.). What gave rise to the making of these collections we cannot say, and of the epoch when they were made it is difficult to judge, for revisions seem to have taken place. In any case they are a reflection of the time of the political rise of Israel and of the prime of its physical and psychical life. In conclusion we shall mention here two longer poems, both of which are claimed to be from the hand of Moses. They are Exodus xv. 1–18 and Deuteronomy xxxii. 1–43. They are two theological contemplations on the leading of Israel by God, according to the manner of the so-called historical Psalms. Therewith we have characterized in outline the literary matter of which the Pentateuch is built up.

After having sketched in the foregoing Wellhausen's hypothesis about the origin of the Pentateuch, dominant at the present day, and then having pointed out in general the weak points of this hypothesis, we have taken pains to inform the reader in a few strokes as to the manifold parts of this extensive literature. Henceforth it shall be my task to point out in detail how I have changed my mind about the Wellhausen theory and what I think today about the origin of this literature.

As a matter of critical investigation the fifteenth chapter of Genesis has proved itself to be particularly difficult. In this chapter we are said to have before us, for the first time, the Elohist document, and the text is generally assigned to the two sources, J and E, in the following manner: The part of verse 1, "After these things," is assigned to E; "the word of Jahve came," to J; "unto Abram in a vision," and further, "Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield," is assigned to E; but, on the other hand, "and thy exceeding great reward," to J. Of verse 2, the first half belongs to J, the second to E; of verse 3, evidently for the sake of change, the first half is assigned to E and the second to J. Henceforth only whole verses are dealt with. Verse 4 is assigned to J, verse 5 to E, and we must not wonder that verse 6—clearly for the sake of fairness—is allotted to J. The matter is dealt with after this manner in Holzinger's "*Kommentar zur Genesis*," 1898, page 147, and we may see the same in Paul Haupt's "The Sacred Books of the Old Testament," also in "The Book of Genesis," edited by C. J. Ball, page 11, colored in light-blue and pink. Such literary performances of the critics must cause every sensible person to raise the question as to whether we are going to work in the right way at all, in applying such principles to critical investigation. And we have, in fact, become rather more cautious in the application of these principles, without abandoning them entirely. In the translation of the Old Testament by Kautzsch (fourth edition), in which Holzinger has treated the Book of Genesis, one finds in the margin of chapter xv. only the cipher J E, while in the introductory remarks a more exact partition is looked upon as possible. This latter is also attempted by Eissfeldt again in his "*Hexateuchsynopse*," page 23.

Stimulated by these and similar observations, I have at first examined the Priestly Code which has been characterized as the source most certain to be recognized—for the present only in Genesis. My results, under the

title "*Untersuchungen zum Hexateuch problem I*," will appear as "*Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*" I have attempted in this treatise to produce the evidence that the independent source P—taken for granted by the critics—has never existed; or rather, I have shown that many separate verses alleged to have come from P are indispensably essential parts of the present text, for instance, in chapters xii., xiii., xvi., xxi. I cannot here bring forward information in detail, on account of the many exegetic specialties, and refer therefore to my treatise. In other places which for reason of the linguistic peculiarities had been assigned to P, it became manifest that these alleged marks of distinction for P were later interpolations, as, for instance, chapter xxxi. 18; xxxviii. 18; xxxv. 6. Difficult as it might be for any one to controvert my judgment of xxxi. 18*a*, in face of the exaggeration of terms, yet in chapter xxxv. 6 it would, on account of linguistic reasons, be simply impossible, because the sentence "which is in the land of Canaan" is separating the words "to Luz" and "that is, Bethel" from each other. But if no value is attached to separate verses, neither are the two long chapters xvii. and xxiii. taken from the history of the patriarchs, to be acknowledged as essential parts of the Priestly Code. The above-mentioned story, in chapter xxiii., of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah by Abraham, bears a totally profane character and may scarcely be taken as an element of a priestly document. The only argument to which the critics appeal in assigning the chapter to P is the linguistic peculiarities, and just this, in our case, has no demonstrative force at all as B. D. Erdmans, in his "*Alttestamentliche Studien I*," has pointed out. Chapter xvii. is, as I have already shown, a text combined of several elements with various contents, and its main part (verses 9–14) is the section about circumcision. That it is interpolated is quite plainly to be recognized by reason of the catch-word

"covenant." But while the covenant spoken of in verses 2 ff. consists in a promise of God to Abraham, from verse 9 onward the covenant suddenly signifies an obligation for Abraham and his descendants. As I suppose (compare the end of this treatise), the section about circumcision is inserted in our chapter by the same hand which in chapter i. 1, 2, 4 (the account of the Creation), interpolated the scheme of the days together with the section of the day of rest.

A strictly systematic, formal style has been assigned to the Priestly Code, all information relating to genealogy, time, and statistics being considered as belonging to it. With regard to genealogies there are several, such as the so-called list of the Sethites (chapter v.) or the genealogy of Shem (chapter xi. 10 ff.), which are the product of learned speculation; and again others which are based upon valuable historical tradition, as, for example (chapter xxv. 12 ff.), the record of the Ishmaelites, or the various registers about Edom in chapter xxxvi. In any case they are not all of the same origin and can therefore scarcely be all attributed to one and the same source document. The particulars, however, given about the age of the first parents and patriarchs form a chronological net that not until a quite late date and with a special intention was thrown over the whole literature of the Pentateuch. Concerning it scruples have already been expressed by Harold M. Wiener and Rudolph Smend quite independently of each other. Then I have shown in my above-mentioned treatise that Genesis xvii. 23–27 is an addendum to the rest of the text of quite late date and, above all, that it cannot come from the author of the inserted section about circumcision (verses 9–14), but must be of more recent date than that. If, however, one single element of this chronological system or, as we called it, net, proved to be of a late date, then must all the elements be, for they depend one upon another. To the statistic

information which is said to be characteristic of the Priestly Code the *Tholedot* also belongs. Smend had tried in his book "*Die Erzahlung des Hexateuch*," 1912, to point out that this expression was often, if not in every case, introduced. I have also shown in detail that the expression *Tholedot* could not be designated as a characteristic of the Priestly Code at all. The deduction hitherto had only had a negative result for the assumption of an independent source document designated as the Priestly Code. If, however, one leaves out of consideration all the particulars hitherto instanced, and only considers the connection of the matter of the text customarily assigned to-day to the Priestly Code, the situation is by this means in no wise better. After the detailed account of the Creation and the Flood, both of which seem to be connected by the genealogies of the first parents, there follows, after the story of the Flood, still another genealogical tree—namely, that of Shem, which comes down to Abraham. Then follow, as stated, only schematic statements about the patriarchs down to Jacob. The peculiar specification of the matter has already been pointed out. The difficulties which it involves do not diminish when we throw them on to the shoulders of a redactor. (For this also see above.)

Have we, as I believe, the right to call the supposition of the separate existence of a document P a hopeless error, we may follow at once in connection with the doubts about P, already briefly expressed, with a further treatment of Jahvist and Elohist. Do we admit that there were two independent narratives of Israel's earliest past, the question again confronts us concerning them, "According to what principle did the redactor select the matter when the combination took place?" Sometimes he chooses J, sometimes E. Sometimes he inserts a sentence or a formula from E into a longer connected passage belonging to J, or the reverse, as is said to be the case in the story of the selling of Joseph by his brothers. As regards

this story, Jacob Horovitz in his book "*Die Josephserjahling*," 1921, has pointed out that it is an over-hasty exegesis that has brought about the cutting-up of the story of Joseph. Even if one does not always agree in detail with the exegetical calcule of Horovitz, yet with the question as to the principle of the combination, also of J and E, there arises a difficult problem which our higher critics will no longer be able to avoid. Another question is this: Are we in a position at all to separate properly one from the other two sources or two parallel traditions? I do not doubt, as I have explained in the above, that for the narration of the patriarchic history in Genesis, old documents—*i. e.*, records—have been at the disposal of the authors and have been used by them; neither do I for one moment deny that many pieces of this tradition-matter may be of northern Israelitish and many of southern Israelitish origin. But that this traditional material may be assigned to two ancient sources of quite decided tendency and quite decided age and origin is doubtful to me, and for the two following reasons. Beside the distinguishing between the existing source-matter by the help of the names for God (the unsatisfactoriness of which we have discussed above) it is usually pointed out that J shows a preference for the Judaic south as his home, whilst the Elohist favors the north as his home—*i. e.*, the territory of Ephraim. There are, however, numerous exceptions to the correctness of this statement. The town of Abraham is, after all, Hebron, but he built his first altar on Ephraimitish ground near Bethel. He likewise appears as well as Isaac in both sources as dwelling in Beersheba. Both sources give an account of Jacob's vision in Bethel, both of his wrestling with the Godhead in Penuel on the other side of Jordan. The Elohist knows too of Jacob's living in the valley of Hebron (Gen. xxxvii. 14). In this way one can scarcely speak of a Judaish or Ephraimitish tendency of the two supposed sources. Neither is there to

be found anywhere the slightest intimation of a division of the kingdom into a southern and a northern kingdom. To this comes, as a further difficulty, the fact that in many places a discrimination between the two documents is impossible. I have already pointed out how cautious one has gradually become in assigning chapter xv. to J and E. The difficulty of the assignment increased particularly in the story of the departure from Egypt. This difficulty is easy to comprehend, for the Elohist is only sporadically present there at all. In Genesis xx. and xxii. he suddenly appears, and then he serves chiefly only for filling up the gaps. Only in chapter xxvii. can one speak of prominence being given to the Elohistic story. According to this it will scarcely be possible to speak of two independent parallel narratives of the patriarchic history.

This may be the right place to add a word about the two technical terms Pentateuch and Hexateuch. As we have already remarked, we should, for material reasons, like to see the book of Joshua in the closest connection with the so-called Five Books of Moses, for in this book the chosen people are shown the land which is to be their home, where they are to live as they were destined by God and which is the only place where they can fulfill their task. How is it now with formal reasons? In other words, is the text of the book of Joshua composed of the same source-matter as the so-called Five Books of Moses? This question is prodigiously difficult to answer. The contents of the book of Joshua are entirely different from those of the Five Books of Moses. This makes a comparison of the literary physiognomy of both more difficult from the outset. The question as to whether the book of Joshua is derived from the same sources as the Pentateuch has been repeatedly gone into, but so far incontrovertible information as to the sources of the Pentateuch is not forthcoming. It is characteristic how restrictive in their judgment even the critics are who otherwise view the matter quite

from Wellhausen's standpoint. Cornill says in his "*Einleitung ins A. T.*" (page 87) that one must expect *a priori* the same authors in the book of Joshua as in the Pentateuch, but the analysis of the former is incomparably more difficult, and the results not to be given with the same critical certainty as in the Pentateuch. Sellin in his "*Einleitung ins A. T.*" (page 67) is even of opinion that the analysis of the sources has not so far led to generally acknowledged results; perhaps in the first half of the book J was wholly absent. When, therefore, we speak of the Hexateuch, we mean that we have only a view of the connection of the matter, or apply the expression in the sense of the critics.

Deuteronomy is, as is known, the Archimedean point from which the higher critique believes it can shake the Pentateuch world to its foundations. And for many years it has been characterized as the most certain result of the Old Testament science, that the Book of the Law from 2 Kings xxii. is identical with the kernel of our book of Deuteronomy. This certainty is to-day in no wise undisputed, and indeed one may say the Deuteronomy problem has been in full flow again for many years. On the strength of minute exegesis and careful comparison of Deuteronomy with the remaining laws of the Pentateuch, critics have begun to perceive the difficulties and to admit the weaknesses in the solving of the problem as it now stands. The arguments for the solution of the Deuteronomy problem up to now, as they are represented by Wellhausen and his adherents, rest upon the theory of development —the progress from the simple to the complex in our case, from the many sanctuaries of Jahve that were in the land, to the one chosen of God; from the Levites to the Hierarchy consisting of the High Priest and priests of a first and second order—*i. e.*, the real priests and the Levites; from Henotheism to the theoretical Monotheism and so on. Accordingly it is said that a rise from the Book

of the Covenant to Deuteronomy and from Deuteronomy to the laws of the Priestly Code is to be verified in the legislature of the Old Testament. No one will doubt of the progress of Israel in the different provinces of intellectual life—provinces of religion, ethics, legislature, literature, and otherwise; neither will he doubt that the reflection of this progress is clearly to be recognized in the literature of the Old Testament. But it is questionable whether the information given above as to the succession of the laws be correct. Of these laws one ought really, after all, to examine each one as to its real character—*i. e.*, as to its purpose in the community in which it was carried into force. In going into this question two requisitions must be made—that of a well-grounded exegesis and that of the avoidance of all possible false conclusions, among which, for instance, the deductions by the help of the *argumentum e silentio* have been the most fatal.

Concerning my doubts about the present-day dominant interpretation of the Deuteronomy problem, they are raised first against the distinguishing different sections of the text in the so-called "singular-document" and "plural-document"—*i. e.*, a recension using the singular form of address, "thou" and "thy" and another using the plural form "ye" and "your." So little as I deny that the text of Deuteronomy just as well as that of the other books is enriched by remarks and interpolations and is therefore not present to us in its original form, whereby the differences between the Masoretic text and the text of the Septuagint and the Samaritan are to be considered; so little can I approve of this analyzing of the text, for the use of the two forms of address varies at times within the limits of the same verse—for instance, chapters i. 31, vi. 1–3, 17, and 18; viii. 1, 2, 19, 20; ix. 7; xi. 12 f., etc. It cannot possibly act as a finger post to two different recensions that are supposed to be united here. It would be impossible (and it is worthy of notice that no one has

attempted it) to picture to oneself the way in which this fusion of recensions may have taken place.

Further, it is questionable to me whether the command to offer sacrifices only in the sanctuary chosen by Jahve was originally only to be understood in all passages as referring to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. See, for instance, chapters xii. 18, 26, xviii. 6, where only the place is spoken of that Jahve will choose; it may be understood of the place in every tribe, and for this reason it says, in chapter xii. 5, "of all your tribes." Not until later, in my opinion, did this command refer specially to Jerusalem, and was correspondingly given in detail as in chapter xii. 14, where the place is spoken of which Jahve will choose in one of the tribes. This construction has become the dominant one and presents itself to us, for example, in the speech which King Solomon makes at the dedication of the Temple (1 Kings viii. 44, 48), where the town chosen and the Temple built in it, are spoken of. This interpretation of the above passages would agree exceedingly well with the fact that at the coming of Israel into the western side of Jordan an altar of unhewn stones was really set up to Jahve on Mount Ebal, at Moses's command (Deut. xxvii. 4–6), and further with the fact that in preëxilic times a series of sanctuaries were perfectly legitimate, as those in Kedesh, Shechem, Hebron, Ramoth in Gilead (cf. Joshua xx. 7). These cities, as they are designated at the same time as cities of the Levites, may be looked upon as places where sanctuaries of Jahve existed; at the same time they are so-called cities of refuge—*i. e.*, at their far-famed sanctuaries he who had slain another by mistake might take refuge from the avenger of blood. This material leads me, however, to further doubts which are directed against the Wellhausen opinion that the laws of the alleged Priestly Code are more recent than the Book of Deuteronomy. In Deuteronomy xix. 1–13 we have a law about the cities of refuge, and again in Numbers xxxv. 9–19. The

comparison of both passages with reference to the definition as to what a homicide and what a murderer was (Num. xxxv. 16 ff. with Deut. xix. 5), makes me inclined to seek the older mode of the definition of these two conceptions in the detailed manner of Numbers xxxv. Another argument is that Deuteronomy xix. 4 clearly presumes an earlier institution; to which it may be remarked that this is by no means the only instance where the Book of Deuteronomy reveals earlier institutions. It seems to me quite probable that Numbers xxxv., in some sort of form, contains a very ancient Thora about the right of refuge for one who had committed unpremeditated manslaughter, and to this Thora Deuteronomy xix. refers. With this criticism of the relations between Deuteronomy xix. and Numbers xxxv. I in no way agree with those who look upon the Book of Deuteronomy as a recent, or at least comparatively recent, literary work. There are some laws which afford ground for objections to this theory, laws of which, for brevity's sake, I will mention only two: first, the command about the extermination of the Canaanites (chapter vii. 1 ff.; chapter xx. 13, 17 ff.), which can ill be attributed to a time when the Israelites had lived in the land for centuries and had absorbed the Canaanite population; but well attributed to the time of the first invasion. Second, the command to exterminate the male inhabitants without mercy agrees well with the other command to utterly destroy their places of worship. The religious fanaticism particularly of the early days of the Hebrew religion is so unmistakably alive in these commands that one wonders how they could have been adjudged to a race which had accidentally gone so deep into the waters of a religious syncretism. There is, secondly, something similar in the command (Deut. xxiii. 7) not to "abhor an Edomite," for the reason that "he is thy brother." It has already been remarked that the tradition of the patriarchal story of Jacob and Esau's brotherhood must be very an-

cient; that it certainly cannot have had its origin in historic times. The same holds good with regard to this command in the Book of Deuteronomy. It must not be denied—to repeat it once more—that our canonical Book of Deuteronomy has received additions and suffered revisions, but its kernel must be taken for what it is and will be—a very ancient book of Mosaic origin, to which not a few elements of its contents—elements of great weight—bear evidence. I feel myself obliged to give expression to this my opinion even should it bring upon me from my colleagues the sentence of excommunication for a want of scientific method.

It was from the elements which, in the foregoing, I have first sketched generally, and then criticized in detail, that Ezra in conjunction with his assistants in Babylon compiled the Book of the Law of God. At least, so I should like, in conclusion, to presume. With the help of this book about the middle of the fifth century B.C., he—Ezra—thought to reform and to build up the Jewish community in Jerusalem, and, indeed, aided by the prudent and energetic Nehemiah, did reform and build it up (cf. Neh. viii.–x.). In this way then the Pentateuch also reflects clearly the religious mode of viewing things of the Jewish community, during the time of exile. The juxtaposition of universalism and particularism is characteristic of it; side by side with God's covenant with Noah stands the covenant of Jahve with Moses in Sinai. With the conception of humanity the whole literature begins. The respect for the life of the neighbor, whereby not only the Israelite but also the alien is understood, and the social care for the same, belong to its most beautiful commandments (cf. Gen. ix. 6 and Lev. xix. 34). Moreover particularism, national consciousness, is not neglected, as when in Genesis, as also in Deuteronomy, the Divine promises that the land of Canaan shall belong to Israel are repeatedly referred to, and when it is further shown how in the fami-

lies of the Patriarchs the pureness of blood is always preserved. It is certainly freely admitted that occasionally a mixture with alien blood takes place as in history it is not otherwise possible (cf. Gen. xxxviii.). This juxtaposition of universalism and particularism is psychologically conceivable. The universalism grew out of primitive particularism as Israel Abrahams, in his book, "Permanent Values in Judaism" (New York, 1923, page 20 f.), has shown. He says very rightly: "Take away the particularism and you destroy the universalism." Further characteristics are the bringing into prominence of the seventh day of the week as a day of rest—the word "Sabbath" is perhaps intentionally avoided—and circumcision as the two symbols of the religion of Jahve.

The text of the Pentateuch as compiled by Ezra has not remained unchanged. Not only is it—to say nothing of the misrepresentations of the same—provided with various additions, to which, speaking only of Genesis, chapters xiv., xxxviii., xlix. may be counted, but, above all, the chronological net, of which we have already spoken, has been added. The learned interest of many a reader, as well as the vital energy and the lot in life of the community, have contributed to the text's having—to a certain extent—continued to flow. Unfortunately, more exact knowledge is wanting, especially with regard to the domestic history of the community in the post-Ezraic times, in order that we might show more clearly the changes which the text of the Pentateuch underwent at that time, and, above all, to allege reasons for these changes.

The text before us to-day is centuries younger than Moses—that cannot be denied. But Moses, whom we may imagine as being, doubtless, acquainted with the art of writing, laid the foundation of this literary edifice. The generations after him have untiringly and in various ways collected the further material for the building. Ezra, in

the main, erected the building, only trifling changes having been made after him. But the great, strong spirit, teaching community or single individual the spirit of the founder of the Jahve religion, lives in the whole. This spirit is the binding strength which holds all the separate parts of such varied character together. Therefore we are to be understood, if we call the whole of the lofty edifice after the man whose spirit dwells therein, when we speak of the Five Books of Moses.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 9

The Law and the Prophets

By
THE EDITOR

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1924

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 7.—"Away from Wellhausen," by Martin Kegel, Lic.Thl., Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 8.—"The Five Books of Moses and the Question of Their Origin," by Max Loehr, D.Th., Ph.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Koenigsberg, Prussia. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 9.—"The Law and the Prophets," by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER NINE

The Law and the Prophets.

By the Editor.

IX.

THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.

WERE the Laws of the Israelites first, or were they preceded by the writings of their prophets? Not only the inherited order of the books of Scripture, but the testimony of the books themselves, is to the effect that the law was at the beginning, followed by the messages of the prophets. But modern criticism has supposed the exact opposite of this to be the case, and has built up a complex literature in the effort to make its contention good. Here, indeed, the last analysis of the critical problem is to be exhibited; here the final issue is to be joined.

The reasons for accepting the traditional order of this development, the law coming with the integration of Israel's national life, and the prophecies following, several centuries later, as the florescence of national consciousness, seem so natural and logical that the wonder is that it ever could have been disputed. But scholastic necessity has never wanted for an invention to serve it in the stead of rejected reason. We must, therefore, seek to set reason against invention, and contend for the order of history and logical relationship. It cannot escape the apprehension of the reader that, this point being once settled in favor of the law, the cause of higher criticism loses its place in the arena. It is this that has led us, more than once, in the course of this Series to remark that the settlement of the problems of criticism relates to a few major points. These points are all involved, more or less, in the question of the priority of the written law.

For reasons of directness, I choose to present the argument for the priority of the law in categorical form. The categorical certainty of the priority which we seek to establish for the Israelitish law lies in the direction of that

law's relationship to a general legal history of the nations, and of its own impingings upon the experiences of the people who particularly created it.

1. Is the Israelitish law, or any considerable part of it, to be regarded in the light of a national constitution? If so, then the presumption is inevitably in favor of its primordial emergence. Constitutions are the primary and fundamental forms of law. That the Israelitish law of Sinai was primary must go by default of contention; there is no record of any antecedent tribal code whatsoever. That it was fundamental is on its face and in the details of the record. It creates the beginnings and the institutes of a new and distinct government—a judiciary, a body of archons, a militia, a taxing system, and a general administration. Without reference to time and place of writing, these elements of the law must be recognized and allowed. In whatever manner enacted, and at whatever time promulgated, the Israelitish law appears with the form and the force of a constitution. So much of the ground is, therefore, cleared.

The precedents of history multiply to the point that the legal institutions of the nations antedate the bodies of their literature. The literatures of the Gentile nations resemble the Hebrew prophecies at least in the important particular that they generally partake of the character of poetry. Poetry, though a primitive form of literature, does not reach its stages of coherency except in settled and law-protected conditions of society.

The statutes of Lycurgus and Draco precede the age of heroics and tragedies in Greece. The senatorial enactments of Rome and their connecting antecedents go back to Romulus or Æneas, or whoever laid the foundations of the Eternal City; the Æneid was a creation of many centuries later. The stele of Hammurabi is older by a thousand years than the clay tablet libraries of Nineveh. The Magna Charta of England was a venerable document be-

fore Chaucer lived, and had three centuries of history before the dawn of the Elizabethan age. The anachronism of imagining Shakespeare, Bacon, Spenser, or More before Magna Charta is not half so evident as that of putting Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah before Deuteronomy, and Jeremiah and Ezekiel before Leviticus.

A still more familiar example of the precedence of a nation's constitution over its literary culminations is furnished by the history of our own country. The cabin of the Mayflower and the settlement at Jamestown witnessed the beginnings of a statute-making that may well be regarded as the taproot of the Constitution; and that Constitution historically antedates the earliest period of American literature. Who can conceive of Irving, Poe, Cooper, Longfellow, and Emerson as having flourished before the age of the constitution makers, the age of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin? The contradiction of putting the writing prophets before the work ascribed to Moses is not less in the letter of the case.

2. What bearing have the known tribal conditions of the early Israelites on the question of the priority of their law? The answer is here also in the nature of the facts. The need of development into a coherent nationality called for a constitution, as also for a body of statute laws. It has been rather freely assumed that Moses led out of Egypt an ignorant, nomadic, and half barbaric horde. The case was, however, quite different, as has been abundantly shown by Professor Sellin in his contribution to this Series. Amongst the two million Hebrews of the exodus there were men of wealth and experience in affairs; there were also artists, skilled workmen, musicians, minstrels, and, above all, men of faith and mature wisdom. Yet, for all this, they constituted a people still in national infancy. In Egypt, they had existed as feudatory dependents. When the Pharaohs had not persecuted and enslaved them, they had treated them as children and pensioners. They knew one

father, Abraham, and rejoiced in one hope; but that hope was long deferred. There was no binding covenant, other than the Abrahamic tradition; there was no written compact to hold them together in peace and war, or to prevent their being "scattered abroad," when once they had come, as a free nation, into contact with other peoples.

Naturally, the first work of the wilderness period would be to accomplish the transition of the people from a tribal to a national state, and to anticipate the national needs in the place of their future settlement. That the Pentateuchal law sections cover these needs and anticipations there exists no ground for healthy doubt; nor can there be ground for healthy doubt that the original volume of this legislation corresponded, in material points, to that which is found written in the Pentateuch.

To imagine the Israelitish community in the wilderness as organizing itself into an autonomous state, maintaining its life and morale for forty years; then fighting to victory wars of extraordinary violence, and, finally, settling in resistful strength in the midst of a dozen enemy nations—and all with only an oral *tora* to bind and guide its millions—overleaps and contradicts all the precedents of history.

Nor must it be overlooked that the Mosaic law makes appeal to its own binding and nation-shaping influence. In Exodus xix. 5 ff. we read of what this influence, if faithfully responded to, will result in for the nationality of Israel in the land of promise. The divine pledge is specific: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people. . . . And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou (Moses) shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

What beggary, indeed, what malevolence, must be attributed to a providence which should cause such words to be written only after centuries in which this people, left without a law, had lost both its nationality and its liberties!

This is only one of the many difficulties which the higher criticism must meet.

3. To what extent does the religious character of the Israelitish law testify to its priority? All history and all the records of archæology point to the fact that religion is the primary influence or instinct of the race. Man has been described, and not inaptly, as a religious animal. His first concern, under whatever conditions found, is for his religious rites and sacrifices. The earliest writings of paganism were in the nature of short decretals establishing, providing for, and enforcing worship at the shrines of particular deities. The Vedic hymns came only after Brahmanism had emerged from fetishism into a cult of meditations and abstractions. The shadows of Vedic law fall far behind these hymns.

Israel in the wilderness looked forward to nationality in the land of promise; but that nationality was to be a religious one. By every token of covenant and tradition, the commonwealth was to be a theocracy. Essential to the realization of this theocratic ideal was an outward government of priests—a hierarchy. This hierarchy must be charged not only with the religious administration, but also largely with the secular welfare. To secure not only the beginnings of operation, but to bring coördination and to insure perpetuity, there must ensue an instant functioning of the priesthood. To guarantee the priestly authority, there must be an instant writing; and this is exactly what is claimed in those parts of the Pentateuch which directly cover the events and the institutes of the beginning. That such writings were possible, even easy, of execution in the time of Moses has been abundantly shown. With this showing, the necessities and the possibilities of the case converge toward the point of certainty.

4. Do the agricultural statutes of the Israelitish code argue an earlier, rather than a later, enactment? The higher critical contention at this point is familiar to all.

Since, as the critics hold, the Israelites coming out of Egypt were a pastoral people, and since agriculture in the wilderness was impossible, the presence in the code of agricultural statutes and regulations is, of necessity, to be accounted for on the basis of a late enactment. But neither the premise nor the conclusion of this argument by any means follows.

In the first place, the assumption that the Israelites of the Exodus were ignorant of agriculture is bald. It is, in the face of the record, the one upon which the critics themselves pretend to rely; as it also is contrary to what follows from our knowledge of the geographical situation of the Israelites in Egypt. The land of Goshen, the topography of which is fairly familiar to us, admitted of both agricultural and pastoral pursuits amongst the descendants of Jacob, to whom it was assigned by Pharaoh. The eastern reaches, which break into hills along the Red Sea shore, could support only a pastoral population; but the western borders dip into the broad delta of the lower Nile, and was favorable to extensive agricultural engagements. In Deuteronomy xi. 10 it is recited in what manner the Israelites had tilled the soil in Egypt: "Where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs." It was also remembered that in Egypt they had eaten cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, and garlic, and that *freely*. The quantities of "bitter herbs"—endive, succory, or horehound, possibly all—consumed in the first Passover, would indicate a varied domestic agriculture. That irrigation was extensively employed by the Israelites during their stay in Egypt also follows of necessity.

But over and beyond all stands the fact that agriculture was the expectation, and was to be the national occupation, in the land to which the liberated tribes were journeying. The forecast of this was one of the most certain of the wilderness memories: "The land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. And your

threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time; and ye shall eat your bread to the full, and dwell in your land safely." (Lev. xxvi. 4, 5.) To describe this as the gloss of a late redactor or the purposeful "enveloping" of an Elohistic or Jahvistic forger is to appeal to the ear of hopeless credulity.

The first experience of the tribes on their settlement in Canaan was transition from the nomadic and pastoral conditions of the wilderness to almost exclusively agricultural pursuits. The flock became of secondary importance compared with the field. It was, therefore, a paramount need that laws relating to land ownership, entailments, tithes, or taxes of fruits and grain and eleemosynary gleanings should be fixed beforehand. It is not thinkable that a community ramifying practically the whole of Palestine, with common agrarian statutes, land entailments, tithe, and harvest regulations should have been found within the century following the conquest without a precedent constitution with corresponding law enactments.

The story of the daughters of Zelophehad, which fell out at the time of the conquest (Num. xxvii. 6 f.), discovers a law of land inheritance which is found to be in force more than a century later. See Ruth iv. 4, where the law of entailment is illustrated in an apposite history. This story of the daughters of Zelophehad has in itself all the marks of historical genuineness. To charge it to the work of a forger or redactor is pitifully to beg the question. But the critical method of treating the Pentateuch has been a constantly disguised begging of the question.

5. What bearing upon the Mosaic origin of the law does the known existence of other elaborate ancient codes have? Naturally, the Code of Hammurabi is suggested in this connection. We have seen how inevitable it is that Moses should have known this code, and also the wide and deeply grounded "common law" basis upon which it rested. This common law consciousness of the Western Asiatic

nations, with its concomitant literature, must give us a new estimate of the community sentiment of the peoples of the ancient Orient in the time before and during the formation of the Old Testament canon. But Egypt also had a very ancient code of laws which seems to have been in full force during the age of Moses; and the conclusion cannot be escaped that these laws were largely related to agriculture. The fact that these laws are not to be read in detail from the hieroglyphs weighs nothing in the face of facts which we know concerning slave labor, the royal corn portions, and the rights of property in cattle, land, and houses, and especially in the distinct statutes governing the lands of the religious orders, represented by the priests. The indictment against Moses for slaying the Egyptian, legal midwifery, birth repression, sanitation, military service, and the like, of which we have certain record, may be added to the list of evidences. The story of the money and of the viceregal cup of Joseph in the grain bags of his brethren would indicate that thus early there were stringent laws against theft, probably punishable with death. The Israelites of the Exodus would have been familiar with these laws, which no doubt served as a secular basis for their wilderness constitution, just as the temple art and architecture of Egypt formed the basis of the ideals for their wilderness tabernacle and its furniture and service. The wilderness cult and creations were not servile patternings after Egypt, but show signs of those influences which have passed from one nation to another in the order of their advancement.

Moses spent the first forty years of his life in close contact with the administrative machinery of Egyptian law, in anticipation of, and in preparation for, his reign as a Pharaoh. He could not have failed to be influenced by the higher ideals and sounder letter of that administration. Most Pharaohs had finished their work at this age. It was certainly sufficiently long to incarnate the justice and

ethics of the code which he was destined to sponsor. If the laws of Israel, set forth in the wilderness, in any real wise preserved or followed the tenor of that code, it is then established that the laws of the Egyptians shared the general spirit and letter of the "common law" of the then extant nations, output of that still older consciousness of humanity with which the Scriptures preserve a constant and historic connection.

In the book of Daniel we meet with an intimation that the Medes and Persians had a legal record going back to a great antiquity. Whatever this unvarying legal letter was, it antedated the Zend Avestas and the Bactrian sagas of the sun. In his brochure in this Series Professor Loehr refers to an ancient Asiatic law as follows:

> For years I have supported the theory of the genuineness of the Decalogue and should like only to add that the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," fits into no other period of Israelitish history better than at the days of the founding of the religion of Jahve; and a whole series of the remaining commandments is, as we know, through the civilization of primitive nations, as that of the old Western Asia, older than Moses.

I deem it here desirable to speak more in detail concerning a point briefly stated above; not only to make the statement clearer, but because of its great importance to the facts involved in this discussion. The discovery of certain points of similarity between the Hammurabic and the Mosaic codes once gave no little uneasiness to conservative scholars, but without reason. Any resemblances that may be traced do not argue a copying or other particular dependence on the part of the Hebrew lawgiver; but only that the Babylonian code was an earlier echo of a common ethical standard which prevailed throughout Western Asia and Egypt during the whole of the second, and perhaps the third, millennium B.C. This was the form of the general human consciousness with which the theocratic constitution of the Israelites was blended. The operation of the

Divine Spirit purged this consciousness from the dross of polytheism, and gave a perfect result in the law of the Lord. Two elements are thus observable in the Israelitish law—namely, the purged and enlivened human consciousness, the patriarchal residuum of the Old Testament, and the exclusively revealed oracles of Jehovah. Moses stood in the reciprocal state of prophet of the Spirit and world lawyer. This must be taken as the settled ground of true Pentateuchal criticism.

6. To what extent does the Deuteronomic question contribute to the claim of the law's priority? Deuteronomy yields certain very strong internal evidences. In reading the historical sections of that book, the impressions of verisimilitude are quite distinct. (See Deut. i. 6 ff.) The language is candid and unaffected; there is utter absence of that artificiality which under no circumstances can be avoided by the impersonator. The natural recurrence of the personal pronoun, and especially in those connections where the content is most affirmatively Mosaic, carries convincing force.

A considerable section of the higher criticism has constantly held to the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue as an *oral tora*. Whatever argument attaches to the Decalogue goes equally to other sections, as i. 9 ff., iv. 1 ff., and especially with vi. It may also be remarked that a forger would have avoided the lacunæ and paragraphical breaks in composition, which are destined to become strong points in the argument of the new conservative criticism, as showing that this book, with the others of the Pentateuch, was put together from authentic documents, written at the time of the occurrences described as contemporaneous.

The phrase, "on this side Jordan," with its ingenuously attached geography (Deut. i. 1), is direct proof that the historical sections of Deuteronomy originated in the lands east of the Jordan. The minute linking up of Horeb and Kadesh-barnea (verse 2) would not have been thinkable,

scarcely possible, in the work of a counterfeiter. The counter phrase, "on the other side of Jordan" (the west side), is used at Deuteronomy xi. 30, again clearly showing that the writer was on the eastern terrain. In the book of Joshua (ix. 1) occurs again the phrase, "on this side Jordan," but in connection with a geography which obviously places the writer on the western or Mediterranean side. Similarly, Joshua ix. 10 refers to the land of the Amorites as lying beyond Jordan from the writer, thus properly putting him in the west.

The Revised Version, for "this side Jordan" (Deut. i. 1), reads, "beyond Jordan," and so throughout, wherever the inflected Hebrew word *beber* occurs. This is, however, arbitrary, and disregards a rule which makes the meaning of the word dependent upon its connection; which rule was carefully observed by the King James versionists. I have noted sixteen passages in the Hebrew Old Testament in which this word occurs, and of which the Authorized rendering is "beyond," "other side," and "this side," as the connection indicates. In thirteen of these cases *eber* occurs with the preposition (as at Deut. i. 1) and with identical Masoretic pointings. At Deuteronomy xi. 30, Joshua vii. 7, xii. 1, xx. 28, xxiv. 8, and Judges x. 8 the rendering is "the other side." Genesis l. 10, Deuteronomy iii. 25, Joshua ix. 10, xiii. 8, and Judges v. 17 read "beyond." Deuteronomy i. 1 reads "this side," and with this agree Numbers xxxii. 19 and 1 Chronicles xxvi. 30. The Revised Version reads "beyond" at both Deuteronomy i. 1 and xi. 30, which must confuse the critics not a little, in view of their contention that Hilkiah fabricated Deuteronomy at Jerusalem, during the reign of Josiah, while this rendering would put him in the Arabah of Moab, on the eastern side of Jordan. The truth of the matter, however, is that the Hebrew *beber*, used in all the passages cited above, must have its meaning decided by geographical or topographical relations. It is used for both "the other

side" (beyond), and for "this side"; though, as Dr. Adam Clarke observes, at Deuteronomy i. 1, where its position is determinative, it means neither one nor the other, but signifies the passage or ford of the Jordan, which the waiting Israelites were about to take on the way to the conquest of the lands west of the river.

The argument is weak indeed which must refer these innocently correct indications of the compass to the studied plans of a forger. What is said of these entries is true of the whole recapitulatory description given in Deuteronomy of the journeyings of the tribes from Horeb to the passes of the Jordan. The fullness of the detail of this recapitulation, as also the exactness of geographical and topographical relations, so far as archæology has been able to testify, are beyond challenge. Moreover, it becomes constantly more impossible that the story could have been fabricated, or anachronistically written, in or near the time of Josiah, or in any period a generation later than the time of the conquest. Some sort of Deuteronomic story might have been fabricated in or near the age of Josiah, but not the one which we know the canonical book of Deuteronomy to be.

The scenes described in this book as having closed the life of Moses cannot but be recognized as historically fitting. The charge to Joshua, the song and the blessing of Moses, are such as must needs have been realized in fact. That they could have been breathed as an opportunist wish from the idolatrous days which immediately preceded the downfall of the Davidic monarchy is an assumption too violent to find hospitality.

7. Does the form, "the law and the prophets," as used in Scripture, include under the title of "law" the whole of the Pentateuch, and assume a common authorship and a common age of writing? It will hardly be denied that this is the case; the Scriptures are throughout consistent on this point. In this respect, however, the problem of Genesis

stands slightly apart from the main issue; its materials belong in a different category from those entering into the other Pentateuchal writings. But it belongs to the Mosaic writings in whatever manner those writings finally may have been assembled; it got into the Pentateuch in the same manner as did the other four members. Our readers are familiar with the brilliant linguistic argument of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson which makes it inevitable that this Genesis book, as to its writing, should be placed in the age of Moses. While, as has already been observed, there is no internal claim of Mosaic authorship, such as is found in the other four books, nothing that can be affirmed from "source" considerations or redactorial emendations can separate it from the Mosaic age. Whatever reduction from original documents, whatever use of older writings, may be represented in it could have been accomplished more logically in the Mosaic age than in a later time; and the internal evidence, in the shape of foreign language terms, serves to place it in the second millennium B.C.

The place of Genesis in the Mosaic scheme of literature is logical. The theocracy, which was realized through the law and its covenants, needed to be articulated with the beginning, particularly through a record of the immanence of God in creation and human history, with a still more particular reference to his providences and choices in the lives of his personal and commissioned representatives.

While the conservative contention freely admits the relation of Genesis to very ancient common sources of traditional and cosmological knowledge, its mechanical reduction from these is confidently disallowed. A divine influence and direction determined the materials and the form of the Genesis of the canon. Here subsists the vast difference between the polytheistic literature of Babylon and the monotheistic Hebrew Scriptures. A single illustration of this principle as it relates to creation will suffice. It is a contention of higher criticism that "the Babylonian

conception of *Tiamat*, the abyss, was reproduced in the Bible conception of *tehom*, the deep," Genesis i. 2.

To say that the story of *Tiamat*, as read from the Assurbanipal tablets, is transferred and reproduced in the Mosaic conception of *tehom* is to build upon mere sound resemblances and swap fancies at a venture. A Dutch windmill resembles an airplane in about the same degree that the story of *Tiamat* resembles the cosmogony of Genesis. There are resemblances, and the resemblances come from the same particular ideas or concepts; but there are also tremendous differences, and these differences refer themselves to widely separated causes. Quite a while ago, I made a comparative study of the two creation stories. I then became convinced, as I am now convinced, that Moses, the author of Genesis, was familiar with the important contents of those very ancient libraries, then reposing at Nippur or elsewhere in Babylonia, from which the Assurbanipal tablets, now in the possession of scholars, were copied in the seventh century before Christ.

Moses's knowledge of this cuneiform literature could have come naturally in either one of two ways—namely, first, as a tradition through the Abrahamic family, and this theory acquires probability when the retentive character of the Oriental memory is considered; secondly, through the personal studies of Moses, when engaged, in earlier years, in mastering "all the wisdom of the Egyptians," in which way he would come to know the Babylonian literature; for about this time Egypt was practically mistress of the Semitic world from the eastern shores of the Red Sea to the northern banks of the Tigris. The Egyptian court, if not sovereign over Babylon, was at least in powerful treaty relationship with it, a Babylonian princess being wife of the Egyptian monarch, all of which is shown by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. These tablets, found in Egypt, show that the Pharaohs and their subjects not only understood the cuneiform writing, but themselves used it in

official correspondence. Nothing could be more illogical than that Egyptian scholars such as were Moses's instructors at Heliopolis should not have known the literature of this writing. Even if libraries were not copied, as was done by Assurbanipal, men saturated with this literature would have carried it from Babylon to Egypt, as was done by the scholars of Northern Europe in the sixteenth century, who transported the newly recovered Greek learning from Italy to England and Germany. Moses's life fell in the very current of this more ancient renaissance. The Nippur tablets, some at least of such as have been recovered, are allowably two thousand to three thousand years older than the Christian era; but they, no doubt, represent the reduction of a still older literature, or tradition, Sumerian, or, it may be, still more remote, in origin. In either case, the primitive monotheists, of which was the family of Abraham, would be in possession of the tradition. And since the whole question of the probability of writing in the age of Abraham has been illuminated and affirmatively settled by recent discoveries, what hindered that he and his sons should have had in their possession particular writings covering the essentials of their faith? These would have been upon such durable materials as terra cotta tablets or small stone cylinders, and might well have survived the period of Egyptian bondage. I venture the judgment that the "images" brought by Rachel from the house of her father in Padan-aram were block-like effigies inscribed with characters which expressed certain tenets of the Babylonian faith. These inscriptions probably indicated the use of these effigies as a means of divination. Ezekiel represents the king of Babylon as using such images for purposes of divination. (See Ezekiel xxi. 21; but xxi. 26 Hebrew canon.) In each case the word used is *teraphim*, thus identifying the "gods" of Laban with the images of the Babylonians. These images, as recovered in modern excavations, are seldom without religious inscriptions. Not-

able examples are the images of Ea and Nebo, deities of the older Babylonians, which are liberally decorated with inscriptions. I do not go so far as to say that the *teraphim* of Laban carried any extended inscriptional statement: but only that they indicated what might easily have happened, and what almost certainly did happen—namely, that the Abrahamic family brought out of Chaldea some coherent and enduring form of writing which preserved the continuity of their faith through their generations. It is not to be supposed that a man of Abraham's character, a man who, in addition to great pastoral pursuits, found time to organize and discipline a feudal army, probably to cultivate the science of astronomy and conduct diplomacy with princes, would have neglected to commit his thoughts and beliefs to some form of writing, and that in an age when writing was all but as well understood and as generally practiced as it was in the days of Alfred the Great. Such writing would inevitably have had to do with the creation and the flood, the two greatest landmarks of primeval monotheism. The reference to a body of "elders" in Israel, even in the time of Egyptian bondage, would indicate that the Jews at the lowest ebb of their racial life had preserved a semblance of tribal government; and no doubt what writings had descended to them from the patriarchs. Nothing short of this will explain their ready acceptance of Moses as a leader.

But from whatever source the cosmogony of Genesis was derived, the preparation of the story shows the presence of a divine illumination with the writer, a fact which grows more apparent as the comparison with other accounts is made more exact. No writings of the age of Genesis, Babylonian, Egyptian, or even the later Hesiodic theogony, exhibit anything in common with the exalted sanity of Genesis and its freedom from myth. The allegorical passages are so clearly marked as to be self-evident. Genesis is unique amongst the writings of early antiquity.

The story of creation as read by George Smith from the Assurbanipal tablets is not different in its general character from like stories told by the Hindus and the Scandinavians. The Assyrian story opens thus:

"In a time when the heaven above was not named
And the earth beneath bore no name . . .
When (was) the abyss, *Tiamat*, the mother of both . . .
Then were born the gods Lachma and Lachamu."

Here at the outset are two tremendous differences between Genesis and the tablets. In the tablets the "abyss" existed before the heaven and the earth. In Genesis the heaven and the earth are concomitants of the abyss, or deep, the potentialities of each emerging in one fiat of the Creator. To be sure, the earth was void and without form, but its constituent matter was coexistent with the possibilities of the abyss.

Again, the tablets are at this tremendous variance from Genesis—namely, that the abyss (*Tiamat*) existed before deity came into being. Indeed, the abyss, mingling its waters, the upper and the nether, produced the gods. Genesis opens with: "In the beginning God"—the uncreated, eternal Jehovah, who of his own mandate, and in amazing order, created the heaven and the earth and all that in them is. What conception of the tablets is here reproduced?

And what shall be said of the string of gods chronicled in this creation story, Lachma, Lachamu, Anshar, Kishar, Anu, Ea, Marduk, Nudimmud—lords many and gods many? Against these stands in Genesis the one God, Jehovah Elohim, who said, "Let there be light," and there was light!

According to the tablet story, war arose between *Tiamat* and the gods which she had produced. The gods

"Prepare for war with gestures of rage and hate,
With combined might to begin the battle."

But *Tiamat* moves furiously to the assault; the gods are dismayed and falter. The language used concerning them

by the tablets is not complimentary. They are seen to be cowards, these gods of Babylon.

> "Nudimmud was afraid and turned cowering back . . .
> Lachma and Lachamu heard and were afraid."

At last Marduk, one of the younger gods, assumed the rôle of leader. By a ruse he takes *Tiamat* in a net, and then slays her.

> "Dividing her body, wise plans he laid.
> Into two halves, like a fish, he divided her.
> Out of one half he made the vault of heaven."

The next tablet is missing. It probably told how Marduk, of the other half of *Tiamat*, made the world. Thus the abyss disappears. In Genesis it remains after heaven and earth are created. In the tablet story *Tiamat* becomes "the mother of both heaven and earth"; and thus there are two creators. Genesis knows but one Creator, the eternal Jehovah. Wherein is the resemblance?

The assumption seems to be that the Assyrian word *Tiamat*, used as the name of the abyss, is genetically the same word as *tehom*, the "deep" of Genesis, and that the author of Genesis was led to adopt it as such. As we have already suggested, there may be a fanciful resemblance in the form of the two words; but if *Tiamat* is derived from the Semitic word *am*, which is mother, or generator (Chaldean, *amah*, stock, family), then it has not a remote kinship with *tehom*, derived from the Hebrew radical, *hu*, meaning *void* or *waste*. The author of Genesis could not have had the name *Tiamat* in mind when he adopted his word for "deep" or "abyss." The Babylonian tablet thus describes the brood of *Tiamat:*

> "The mother of the abyss, she who created them all,
> Unconquerable warriors, gave them giant snakes . . .
> They rear their bodies; none can resist their breast."

Contrast these lines with that simple strophe in Genesis:

> "And the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters."

In one there is the onset of indescribable lawlessness; the abyss is in rebellion against distressed deity. In the other is the vastness of chaos and unformed matter, under the brooding, dove-like wings of the Spirit of God, answering silently and orderly to eternal and beneficent law. Wherein is there a reproduction?

8. What testimony does prophecy itself bear to the claim for the law's priority? There is that in the nature of the office of prophecy which presupposes distinct standards of obligation on the part of those to whom the prophets were commissioned. Distinct judgments and assessed punishments, such as those named in the Hebrew prophecies, cannot be made to comport with the ideals of divine justice, except on the basis of the violation of previously established laws and covenants. Intelligent and conscience-directed criticism can know no stronger evidential argument than this. The nature and purpose of prophecy suppose not only a state of moral understanding on the part of those against whom judgment is denounced; but prophecy anticipates and premises conditions under which ideal obedience to anciently written statutes and covenants becomes possible. The theodicy of Hebrew prophecy would rest upon but indifferent moral grounds if its utterances had preceded the enactment of the great mandatory and prohibitive codes of the Pentateuch. Those who seek to establish so vain a conclusion have parted with the main premise of their syllogism.

No other nation can boast so unique a literature as that of the prophecies of Israel. Sanity, loftiness of ethical ideal and compliance, and sublimity of spiritual consciousness and experience are their distinguishing characteristics. In every instance, their utterances are found to abut, on the human side, on an anciently promulgated law; and, on the divine side, on a Messianic administration, which is to be the complete fulfillment of the laws and hopes of the ancient theocracy. No amount of argumentation or critical

involution can displace the prophecies from this self-assumed attitude. To put them before the law is to disparage eternal prescience.

There is yet another internal argument of prophecy supporting the traditional sequence of the canon; that of the universal element in prediction. The law is racial, national, Israelitish, as to its main setting; the prophecies are, to the same degree, interracial, universal, cosmic. The reverse could only stand as a contradiction; it would be the order of neither thought nor life. The canon is both. The criticism which operates to put the authorship of Joshua and Jonah in the same age, and which has made the Deuteronomist to appear upon a later stage than that of Isaiah, has accomplished a feat of scene-shifting marvelous to contemplate, but impossible to be understood.

The failure of a vast majority of the people of the Israelitish nation to live up to the ideals and standards of their ancient law covenants brought the occasion of prophecy, and induced its denunciations; but the faithful obedience of that part of the people who walked humbly with God in the keeping of his imparted law brought the conditions of the Messianic vision, which was the larger and the final element of prophecy. The primeval law thus bridged its way over prophecy to the kingdom of Messiah; its harsher letter could not have made a sheer contact with the ideals of that kingdom, as criticism supposes it to have done.

The general fact of prophecy has been allowed by criticism; the integrity of its claim has not been wholly denied, but has been shamefully minified. Perhaps the great prophecies are the only books of the Old Testament canon toward which the higher critics have manifested a uniform degree of respect; and yet they have sought to pillage their texts, dispute their dates, and dismember their bodies. Perhaps the prophecies, because of their mighty hold on Christian faith and consciousness, are destined to defeat most completely the methods of destructive criticism.

The cases of the books of Jonah and Joel may serve to illustrate the critical penchant for postdating the writings of certain of the prophets. These emended dates are fixed on thoroughly arbitrary grounds. The book of Jonah, to take one of the writings already cited, is placed by tradition and internal claim in the ninth century B.C., and, according to a collateral testimony, in the reign of Jeroboam II., of the northern kingdom of Israel; but, on no safer hypothesis than a doubtful sentiment of pro-Gentilism, it is placed by the critics in the Greek period of Jewish history. But Dr. Wilson, from the internal linguistic evidence of the book itself, shows a Greek period, or any other late date, to be impossible; and by the same argument places it back in its proper chronology.

There are not a few other reasons for dismissing the contentions of the critics and leaving the authorship and date of the prophecy of Jonah with the son of Amittai and his age. In the first place, as has been intimated already, the chief reason for the displacement of Jonah is the supposed presence of a pro-Gentile *motif*, which the critics conclude can best be attributed to the period of Greek rule, from one to three centuries before Christ. Nothing is more illusive and misleading than the particular *motif* of an ancient writing, unless that *motif* be clearly testified to or confessed by the writer himself. The prophecy of Jonah is largely a recital of historical and miraculous facts, which recital takes care of its proper and essential *motif*. The assumption that the age of Jeroboam II. and antecedent Israelitish times were devoid of interracial sympathy is without proof, and is in the face of a well-established succession of facts. The story of Ruth's reception in Bethlehem-Judah, the common intermarrying of Canaanites and Israelites, the visit of the Queen of Sheba and her court to Solomon, the comity between that prince and Hiram of Tyre, the fellowship of their respective peoples, and the numerous other foreign alliances of Israelit-

ish and Judaic kings relieve the general impression of race exclusiveness amongst the earlier Israelites. Besides, the critics are unfortunate in picking the Greek period as the setting for a pro-Gentile allegory, as they allege the book of Jonah to be. Either just before, during, or just after the Maccabean period the tides of anti-Gentile feeling had reached a particularly pronounced height amongst the Jews. The efforts of the Syrian emperors to Hellenize the populations under their rule had stirred all the ancient religious and race fervor of the children of Abraham and brought it to a bloody resistance. A story whose *motif* should be a plea for the cancellation of German reparation would find as much tolerance in France to-day as the Jonah idyl, which the critics imagine, had found in any near Maccabean period in Judea.

But the time of the reign of Jeroboam II. is peculiarly suited to an incipient, if not overt, interracial *rapprochement*, and particularly as regards such a sentiment for Nineveh. Jeroboam had extended his dominions so that they included the lines of the old Davidic kingdom, exclusive of the territories of Judah; so that the delimitation brought his frontiers to an abutment upon those of Assyria, whose capital Nineveh was. An inscription of Ramman-nirari indicates that relations between the two powers at this time were reciprocal and friendly. The relation of Israel was that of a tributary, but the suzerainty of Nineveh was protective and, to a degree, benevolent.

Thus the territorial and political relations of the two countries are found to have been favorable to the mission of Jonah. In fact, not before, nor again afterwards, were the conditions so favorable for such a mission. The call to Jonah was a divine one, and evoked a purely personal and prophetic response. The known environment of the prophet speaks the principal syllable of probability.

According to Sir Henry Rawlinson, a Babylonian chronicle recites the fact that in a reign prior to the visit of Jonah

a threatened invasion of Nineveh by the Cimmerians had produced a condition of fear on the part of the populace and provoked an edict from the king, both of which we recognize as corresponding to the record in the prophecy. When the Cimmerian siege seemed imminent, the royal edict had ordered a hundred days of oblation, fasting, and prayers. The calamity was averted. While this event is not to be identified with that recorded in Jonah, it shows the religious excitability of the Ninevites of that age, and fits into the letter of the Jonah story.

The fact that the verb in Jonah iii. 3 ("Now Nineveh *was* an exceeding great city") is in the perfect tense is made the basis for a contention for a late date for the writing, per force of which the writer lived after the destruction of Nineveh. This form of statement is, however, not unusual in connections where the object of description is known to be remaining at the time of writing. In Luke xxiv. 13 we read: "A village called Emmaus, which *was* from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs." This was written not more than twenty years after the event described, and no intelligent critic will contend that the village of Emmaus did not still exist. Other like uses of the perfect tense might be cited. An after date of twenty years would not be an unreasonable limit for Jonah's account.

W. Vlock, in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, says the prophecy of Jonah cannot be brought down to a later date than the fifth pre-Christian century. The impossibility of this date is even greater than that of the Greek period; for this would put it during, or just after, the Babylonian exile, which is more than to beg the question on the score of *motif*. Psalm cxxxvii. more correctly expounds the Jewish consciousness of this period than does the book of Jonah.

The accuracy of geographical descriptions found in Jonah, and the agreement of its measurements of the city

of Nineveh with the results of archæology and the accounts of Herodotus tend to strengthen the claims of tradition. To a writer of the fifth century before Christ, the extent of the city of Nineveh would be unknown. Knowledge of its very existence was uncertain. The ten thousand Greeks under Xenophon, who in the fourth century B.C. camped before its ruined walls, were ignorant of its very name. The description of the city in the book of Jonah, as it seems to us, could have come only from an eyewitness.

Consideration of the miracles of the book of Jonah does not belong to this discussion. Two observations, however, seem pertinent in this connection. First, they were set forth for the value of their divine significance and prophetic appositeness. They refer to central facts in the Messianic drama, and so take their place with the other miracles of the Old Testament dispensation. While it is not certain that there is not a scientific basis and explanation of the prophet's experience in the belly of the fish, that experience is the primordial manifestation of a persistence and resurgence in the higher life of spirit which is itself absolute miracle. Secondly, our Lord's use of this miracle to illustrate his own entombing and resurrection gives to it the indorsement of complete validity.

We have given thus much consideration to the critical questions touching the book of Jonah, not only because of the intrinsic interest of the writing, but also because it peculiarly illustrates, as already observed, the arbitrariness of certain scholastic methods. In the cases of the greater prophecies the issues are more difficult of handling in a limited space; though they do not greatly differ in principle from those which are met in the defense of Jonah. The book of Jonah contains but one reference which can be construed as bearing on the temple or Mosaic law; and that is in rather general than technical terms; nevertheless, whatever testimony may be deduced from it goes to the ceremonial covenant. At chapter ii., verse 9, we read:

"I will sacrifice unto thee with the voice of thanksgiving." A formal oblation is implied. See verse 4: "I will look again toward thy holy temple." If, therefore, the prophecy maintains its place in the ninth century (as there is no valid reason why it may not) it sees the ceremonial law at least three centuries before the date allowed it by the critics.

In the critical questions raised concerning the authorship and dating of the prophecy of Joel, much the same peculiarities are to be noted as in the case of Jonah. No contemporary dates are cited in the book itself, and so the critics find their usual license. Two points, particularly, have been stressed—namely, the reference to a Grecian trade in Israelitish slaves and the glimpses of priestly authority in Jerusalem as the one place of national worship. The mere reference to a Grecian region or people is taken as convincing proof of late authorship; just as the presence in Daniel of the doubtful Greek names of imported instruments of music is built up into a theory for the origin of that book in the Greek period of Jewish history. But Dr. Wilson, the acknowledged linguistic authority of our day, is in testimony to the fact that there is not a certain Greek word in either writing.

The word *Javan* in Joel iii. 6 (Hebrew canon iv. 6), which is translated "Grecian" in our Authorized Version, is an old name for the Hellenic people. It evidently occurred in the oldest race summaries, being used in Genesis, Isaiah, and Ezekiel. It occurs in several inscriptions as early as the eighth to seventh centuries B.C. So far from being, in this form, an indication of a late origin of Joel, the presumption is quite the contrary; for it may indeed be doubted if at any time near the Greek era it would have been an acceptable or intelligible designation. The name is used by Ezekiel (xxvii. 13) as an archaism, as also by Daniel and Zechariah. A name has been found in one of the Tel-el Amarna tablets which corresponds, letter for

letter, with the Hebrew "Javan." This name, which is the equivalent of "Ionian," was common throughout the ancient Orient; but from the time of Alexander on the name "Macedonian" was more in order, and would have been used by a writer of his age or thereafter.

The fact that Joel does not mention Assyria or Babylon as enemies of Israel precludes the theory of a postexilic origin. The further fact that he does mention Tyre, Edom, and Egypt as the particular adversaries of Judah and Jerusalem must strongly tend to leave his book to the ninth century before Christ. In this century, Tyre kept up a constant and opulent commerce with the Grecian isles. The exchange of European for Asiatic slaves seems to have been strongly active all this time. With this fact Joel iii. 6 makes pertinent connection: "The children of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border." The Israelites so sold were captives taken by the Tyrians in predatory warfare on Judah. Means and motive for the continuance of such warfare ceased long before the Greek period had well begun.

One critic has quite properly remarked that there is in the prophecy of Joel no ground for the extension of the Jahvistic–Elohistic hypothesis. Nevertheless, the strong support which it gives to the Mosaic ideal of the priesthood has probably decided the critical schools to relegate its writing to an age in which they profess to know that the Jahvists and Elohists wrought many wonderful things, and that out of hand.

Treatment of the prophecy of Isaiah furnishes the most conspicuous example of the mania of destructivism for dismembering the books of Scripture. This mania has magnified apparently inchoate and divergent relations and passed by reconciliatory arguments in the effort to make good a theory. There is, confessedly, an Isaianic problem; but it is not one of diversified authorship, as we

think will at last be found to be the case, but one of a lengthened time of composition and the method of a final assembly of the parts or sections. The writings of a man who filled, during a long and active lifetime, the several and coincidental offices of seer, state historian, and vizier to a succession of monarchs must needs present a literary problem when brought together in such manner as to preserve intact the essentials and results of each service. It is this that has brought certain difficulties to the construing of the writings of Isaiah. Prophetic utterances sometimes take a note of history, and historical anticipations blend into the chords of prophecy. Differences in style, if the fact can be clearly established, relate to lapses of time, advancing ideals, and the invasion of new influences, and hence a correspondingly new nomenclature and clothing of ideas. These are negating facts in the way of the theories of the critics which have not been, and cannot be, successfully disposed of.

It is enough to say that the best answer to the higher critical tinkering of this and other of the sacred writings is that, before any task of alienating or differentiating authorship is entered upon, the method of that authorship must be known and understood. The unity, but not the method, of Isaianic authorship is declared in the writings themselves, reaffirmed by New Testament writers, and accepted by a uniform tradition from the beginning. It has been shown that the methods of ancient authorship, and particularly that which accounts for not a few of the books of the Old Testament, were so different from those followed in the writings of to-day that a common canon of criticism cannot be used. The prophecy of Isaiah claims its origin in the masterful genius of one inspired man. The evidences of the truth of this asserted unity, in the uniform spiritual power and loftiness of ideal which pervade it, far outweigh the scholastic objections which have been urged against it.

The later historical books of the Jews instruct us that an Isaianic literature, outside of the prophecy as we now have it, existed up to a comparatively late date. Some of this we know was historical; much more may have been prophecy. At some time, undoubtedly, it was determined what part of the prolific anthology was to go into the canon. A prophet, equally inspired with his master, directed this selection. The result was still one Isaiah, but a grouping of discourses which represented a variety of styles and a procession of historical sketches, visions, and treatments. This is the answer of conservative criticism to the methods of the radicals.

Hebrew prophecy, while a series of "burdens" and visions succeeding through centuries, is yet one voice, crying the fulfillment of a more ancient law in the kingdom and rule of Messiah. Isaiah describes the crest and peak of this prophecy. Neither before nor after him came a prophet who, as the record is read, could have emended his work after the manner asserted by the critics. Isaiah and Paul stand alone as the interpreters of the atonement and comfort of the Messianic gospel, the one in the old, the other in the new, order of the revelation.

An immediate successor of Isaiah, and the second in the order of the Major Prophets, was Jeremiah. He was also the last of the preëxilic writing prophets, and, with Ezekiel, was destined to see his county's downfall and its people carried into captivity. In the brief biographical sketch of Jeremiah, prefacing his prophecies, we learn that he began to deliver his message in the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah, king of Judah. This was five years before the finding of the law book in the temple by Hilkiah, the high priest. The prophecy therefore covers the period of the alleged fabrication of the Deuteronomic code. This makes a most interesting and significant conjunction. The critics have been quick to see the supposed advantage of it; but it may be said that little has come of the effort made to

force the prophet into becoming a witness for the side of pragmatism. Curiously contradictory have been not a few of the theories adventured. One pass has made Jeremiah the confederate and collaborator of Hilkiah in the alleged Deuteronomic imposture; but Jeremiah knows nothing of the writing of a code of laws, or even the fragment of a code, during the reign of Josiah, or at any time short of the Mosaic age.

A second critical guess is to the effect that the prophet was cognizant of this Hilkiah law book, but set himself in bitter and pronounced opposition to it. Particular instances of this supposed dissent are pointed out; but we shall see for ourselves to what tenor these passages go. The charge against Jeremiah of complicity in the alleged Hilkiah deception is unworthy serious attention; but his silence concerning this law book, of the finding of which he must have had full and exact knowledge, is the strongest possible argument for the Mosaic character of the writing. It was almost certainly not the only copy of the laws of Moses in the kingdom: a copy probably reposed at Anathoth, the prophet's native place, which was once the home of a high priest, and long the seat of a colony of priests and other Levites.

The critical charge that Jeremiah set himself against the Hilkiah law book is dependent upon viii. 8: "How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he it; the pen of the scribe is in vain." This is easily disposed of in the interpretational fact that the language here used is not that of the prophet himself, but what he has put into the mouth of the proud and boastful transgressors of his day. It cannot possibly express, on the part of the prophet, any opposition to a written law. From vii. 22, 23, Jeremiah is adjudged by a very general critical voice to have been opposed to the sacrificial system of the Deuteronomic code: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day

that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." The most that may be affirmed of this utterance is that it emphasizes the spiritual worship of God and the ethical walk of men above the merits of sacrifice and a ceremonial ritual. The prophet's direct reference to the exodus out of Egypt and the resulting covenant of the wilderness is committal of faith in all that pertained to the Mosaic legislation.

The references in Jeremiah xi. 1–8 and xvii. 19–27, so far from showing complicity in, and indorsement of, a fabricated code, are further direct evidence of the prophet's belief in the antiquity of the law and its covenants. In part, this passage reads: "Cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt." "This covenant" can mean in the thought of Jeremiah none other than the compact established between Jehovah and the people of Israel at Sinai. Chapter xvii., verse 22, which enjoins reverence for the Sabbath day, is no less an appeal to the Mosaic origin of the ordinance of the seventh day: "Hallow ye the sabbath day, *as I commanded your fathers.*" This passage has, however, been strictured as an interpolation; but apparently for no more certain reason than that it teaches the previous observance of the Sabbath, a doctrine which is held to have originated with Ezekiel. Such are the devious theories of a self-appraised criticism; but the devout reader may confidently hold that the prophecy of Jeremiah invariably regards the law and its covenants from the viewpoint of unquestioned Mosaic origin.

Ezekiel, the third of the major prophets of Israel, has been freely dealt with by the scholastics. Indeed, they have claimed to find in him one of the chief supports of their program for the eviction of Moses and the late dating

of the law. After 2 Kings xxii. and Ezra viii.–x., which have been made the chief battle ground of the contention over the Deuteronomic and Levitical laws, Ezekiel xl.–xlviii. has taken rank of importance. Wellhausen, as Dr. Kegel has shown, particularly built upon such an interpretation of this prophecy. We shall presently enter somewhat into detail concerning this interpretation. But a brief glance at the general situation of the book will help to an understanding of this.

The genuineness of Ezekiel and the unity of its authorship have never been seriously questioned. Both have stood as self-evident; though we submit that, as it lies in three distinct sections, dealing with more or less divers matters, and that it is veined with historical narratives, it falls in much the same class as Isaiah. But the critics have passed by this aspect of the writing. Perhaps they have reasons of their own for so doing. The corpus is needed in court; an Ezekiel in tact is wanted for testimony. Truth will be the gainer in the end.

While Jerusalem was still standing, and while the prophet was with the first contingent of captives in Babylon, judgments of the severest character against Jerusalem and Judah predominated in his prophecies; but after the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar his messages took on a lofty tone of comfort and promise, distinctly recalling, when read, the messages of the so-called *deutero* Isaiah. Klostermann remarks that while in the first part of his writings Ezekiel buried the hopes of Israel, in the second part he rebuilt both land and people into a spiritual hope. And, what is much to the end of our present contention, this prevision of a new temple, city, and nation is always seen as the result of the restoration and keeping of ancient covenants and laws. The prophetic reverence for ancient observances and ideals reaches its highest expression in Ezekiel, whose zeal for the worship of Jehovah can be compared only to that of Elijah. It is

the pressure of neglected wilderness laws which has forced him into the arena with visions of overwhelming mystery, with denunciations of wrath, and with promises of peace to those recovered through repentance. This call to repentance for the violation of known commandments is high and constant.

While criticism has spared Ezekiel the scalpel of destructivism, it has not hesitated to lay on it the burden of its boldest theorizing. To grasp intelligently the scheme for overturning the traditional order of the emergence of law and prophecy, one must give due attention to the treatment accorded Ezekiel. Again it may be said that this use of Ezekiel is one of the cardinal tenets of the creed of pragmatism which, when discounted, as it will be along with the rest, will clear the way for a reverent and proper understanding of the relation of law and prophecy. The order of the hypothesis respecting Ezekiel may be exhibited in consecutive treatments.

1. The origination of the priestly legislation, or Levitical law, of the Pentateuch is to be credited to Ezekiel. This is in line with what we have before brought together in this Series. Since Hilkiah, in a previous generation, had started the fashion of making laws out of hand, it seemed a natural and logical thing that others would continue it. Ezekiel comes on at a convenient time. But Dr. Martin Kegel, who, in his work on Wellhausen has dealt largely with the Ezekiel problem, has shown that the legal sections of Ezekiel are not legislation; only an idealized program for an idealized theocracy, deduced from ancient statutes and institutes. The temple and the sacrifices of this theocracy are, as Havernick shows, apocalyptic, and never meant to substitute, as such, the settled ordinances and institutions of the Mosaic worship. As a matter of fact, they never did substitute these; and, as Dr. Kegel's argument further indicates, they were never meant to have literal application.

To think of even casually reading the prophecy of Ezekiel, and then imagining it to be the initial springing of the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch, supposes a credulity which must be difficult to even the most willing mind. The perpetual bringing forward by the prophet, along with his narrative and visions, of the wilderness history of the people, and the constant reiteration of the charge of a race-old divergence from express commandments, turn the most clever and circumstantial arguments of the critics into a palpable *non sequitur.* The specific assertion that the Jewish law of the Sabbath originated with Ezekiel has but short shrift in the presence of the prophet's own words in xx. 13: "But the house of Israel rebelled against me in the wilderness; they walked not in my statutes, and they despised my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them; and my sabbaths they greatly polluted: then I said, I will pour out my fury upon them in the wilderness, to consume them."

It should be remarked that the plural *sabbaths* in the above-quoted passage includes the seventh day and the other anciently established holy days, as the feast days, which disposes, on first-rate authority, of the critical claim that the Passover and other feasts of the Jews were of late origin. The critical hypothesis forces itself to an issue on every ground of Israelitish activity. The Hegelian *a priori* is inexorable; the evolutional concept is as hard as iron. Thus it is that criticism has had to take on so many risks that it is now found to be sinking of its own weight.

2. Ezekiel has been particularly designated as the source of the so-called Law of Holiness, imbedded in the Pentateuchal legislation at Leviticus xvii.–xxvi. Graf, for one, considers him the author of that code. But Klostermann has shown this position to be utterly untenable. This Law of Holiness is a consistency of generally short precepts and statutes, which are not political, or even properly civil,

but which have to do with moral and ceremonial matters. It is believed by some that parts of this Law of Holiness were in the hands of the exiled Jews, and in use as a catechism. This would explain much that occurs in Ezekiel; but that Ezekiel is to be adjudged the author of the code goes again to denial in his own words, as read in iv. 14: "Then said I, Ah Lord God! behold, my soul hath not been polluted: for from my youth up even till now have I not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces; neither came there abominable flesh into my mouth." This is a specific reference to a statute of the Law of Holiness, which stands at Leviticus xvii. 15: "And every soul that eateth that which died of itself, or that which was torn with beasts, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger, he shall both wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the even: then shall he be clean."

Observe that the prophet's word is that *from his youth up* he had strictly kept this ordinance. His parents had taught him conformity. From this, it appears that the Law of Holiness was known in the generation before the prophet's time. This would run to a period far anterior to the finding of the law book by Hilkiah. The contention that Ezekiel originated the precepts which he enjoins cannot be made to go on all fours. At xviii. 13 is a strong denunciation against usury, which is also a direct echo of the Law of Holiness, which says: "Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God; that thy brother may live with thee." Other connections with this law might be cited. Of course, the opposition will say that the Law of Holiness subtends the precepts of Ezekiel, and not the contrary; the law expounds Ezekiel and not Ezekiel the law. This is too severe a mental strain, in view of the quite logical and history-supported alternative. As we have before observed, Ezekiel in all his injunctions and warnings makes appeal to ancient ordinances. These

ordinances, as von Orelli concludes, are "nothing else than the Priest Code, whose directions Ezekiel intensifies in many points in the interest of the holiness of God." He is therefore not to be thought of as the creator of this legislation.

3. Ezekiel is credited with sponsoring and completing the conception of the Levitical priesthood, as first instituted in the fabricated code of Hilkiah, identified with Deuteronomy. According to this theory Deuteronomy had no existence until the time of King Josiah, and Leviticus and other parts of the Pentateuch involved in the Levitical law came on only with Ezekiel and the time of Ezra. By a parity of reasoning, the Levitical priesthood could not have had a previous existence.

The reader will recall our former discussion of the tactics employed by criticism to discount the historicity of the Levitical priesthood as established by Moses. So long as that institution remains historically sound the claims of the higher criticism are out of court; Hegelianism is reduced to beggary, and a divine interference and guidance take the place of insensate evolution. The distraint which has been visited upon Ezekiel illustrates the urgency into which the critical party has been brought. He is made to testify against his own words.

There is no intimation on the part of Ezekiel that he is seeking to establish a new sacerdotal order, or even to change one already in existence. In at least one dozen connections in his prophecy the word "priest" is used; but in none of these is left an intimation that the office, as the prophet knew it, had not always existed; nor is there even the appearance of a purpose to change its racial character or alter its functions. Details of an apocalyptic provision and administration there are; but the divergence goes no further. Von Orelli effectively observes on this point that "the Levitical character of Ezekiel's prophecies, which portray the city of God and its cultus under a new *régime*

and in its new details, springs from his sacerdotal education and disposition." Ezekiel was himself a priest, and undoubtedly of the tribe of Levi. Although he never manifests a self-consciousness on this point, yet it is most unlikely that he would have failed to mention an oracle which gave him a new status or altered one which had been anciently derived. His was the ideal of adaptation, not the letter of a new creation. Here again von Orelli's words are noteworthy: "It must not be forgotten that Ezekiel established neither a complete code nor one serving for an immediate use; as a teacher of the Mosaic law he could therefore move more freely in order to emphasize those things which served his prophetic purpose." (Schaff-Herzog, "Ezekiel.")

4. Ezekiel does not mention the office of high priest, therefore that office was not known until after his time. Such is the conclusion of pragmatism. The danger of reasoning too strongly from the silence of an author is so well understood as to need no emphasis here. In the face of other records which affirm the long and continued existence of the high priesthood, the silence of Ezekiel is not to be offered in opposition. Besides, he is equally silent concerning a king; but introduces instead a prince, who might be such a one as Nehemiah or the high priest rulers under the Persian and Greek emperors. Such a functionary would fill the gap in Ezekiel's apocalyptic theocracy. And, finally, it may be safely taken that Ezekiel's whole temple scheme and ritual orders were not meant for literal reproduction, but for the contemplation of Messianic faith and expectation. It was the halfway house, so to speak, from Solomon's temple to the city which lieth "foursquare" in the vision of St. John. The prophet was lifted above earthly things and received words which, if not unlawful to be uttered, were yet not reducible to material equivalents. The measurement of the ideal city wherein was the new temple; the issuing from under the altar of

rising and unassuaged waters, with the impinging shadows of goodly, fruitful trees, were the pledges of the realization of cleansing, healing, sustenance, and largeness in the day of Messiah. These hopes were not smothered in the ritual of the second temple, nor that of Herod. They came with One whose body was greater than all temples.

Again, it may here be taken as determinative of the other details of the Ezekiel problem that the allotting of the land to the returning tribes (Ezek. xlvii. 13 ff.) was, as to scale and detail, purely a spiritual forecast. It looked back to the wilderness camp and to the allotment under Joshua; but it looked forward to a wider world restoration and inheritance in the general citizenship of gospel saint-hood. It was that new earth, matching the new heaven, wherein dwelleth righteousness. To swing this program backward into a falsely claimed wilderness legislation is not only to reverse the order of the canon; but it is to obliterate the signs of the coming of the kingdom of God.

Before finally leaving our study of Ezekiel and the general discussion of the subject of this essay, we may profitably consider the appraisement made by Ezekiel of a fellow prophet and another. At xiv. 14, we read: "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God."

This reference to Daniel and Job is particularly interesting and significant from the fact that the books of the canon represented by the names of these two men have for a long time past been on the spear points of criticism. The authorship of the book known by his name has been denied to Daniel; and Job has been treated as a phantasmal personality. But with Ezekiel, each is preëminently individualistic; nor is it to be reasonably doubted that the estimate of Job was made up from a knowledge of the letter of the book which gives the history of the man of the East. This latter point must have further attention.

The prophet meant to be specific as to his belief in the worthies whom he extolled: "These three *men.*" The identification is twice reaffirmed (verses 16, 18, and 29); and the identification of Daniel is made doubly certain in xxviii. 3, 4: "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee: with thy wisdom and with thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures." Let it be understood that the critics have raised no outcry against the genuineness of Ezekiel. The Masoretic text came to us in none too fair a state; but the Septuagint is in effective evidence. The experts have had their day in the correction. The book passes unchallenged in the verities of its statements. The value of this cannot be missed.

Daniel was an older contemporary of Ezekiel and a fellow captive in the first deportation of the Jews ordered by Nebuchadnezzar. From the statements in Ezekiel, and from the accounts found in the book which bears his name, Daniel, who was a prince of the house of David, must have been in repute for wisdom and sanctity of life before his departure from Jerusalem. Very early after his arrival in Babylon, as is evident from the history, he stepped into a focal of fame which made his name well known not only to his brethren of the captivity, but also to the people in every part of the empire. Such are the clear-cut lines of that personality which tradition has identified with the author of the fourth of the major prophets. Will this identification stand the test? It is one of the left-over tasks for conservative criticism to settle. We have no fear that it will not be settled in the affirmative.

The tendency is, more and more, to reject the whole tissue of scholastic pretexts which has been urged against the traditional view of the age and authorship of Daniel. Naturally, since the explosion of the unscholarly charge of the existence in the writing of Greek words and influences, the claim made for a late date has steadily lost favor. The

overt and challenging prophecies of the book have been a stumblingblock to rationalism; but that feature of revelation will stand out more clearly and confessedly than ever before when the final judgment of faith and learning shall have been passed. The student may take it as a safe position that Daniel will maintain its date and place in the canon of tradition.

The date of Job is not known, nor does the reference in Ezekiel serve to enlighten us on that point. He is there catalogued with Noah as a name of the open sky. Even when his name is associated with that of Daniel, it has a backward look toward antiquity. Neither Job nor the book of that name belonged to the time of Ezekiel. He knew the book and its hero; but both, like the law of Sinai, spoke of a certain antiquity. It was, however, only necessary to mention the name of Job to bring to memory the full testimony written in the book. The effort to thrust Job down the calendar to the period of Greek romanticism is thwarted by both external and internal evidence of a positive character.

The relation of our discussion to the book of Job does not involve so much the historicity of its contents, or the nature of its teachings, as its bearing upon the antiquity of the law. There is, however, a present pertinency in observing that opinion steadily inclines to the holding as history of the basic elements of Job. Such a man lived, as we necessarily interpret Ezekiel to testify. His seat was in the oases lands of Arabia Deserta, eastward, or southeastward, from the Jordan. Indications tend to place him in the age of Abraham and Melchizedek, with the latter of whom he should be in spiritual alliance, as was Abraham. It is not improbable that Job and Melchizedek were of Aryan affinity and represented the most ancient type of partriarchal monotheism. The Salem seat of monotheism was probably the human determinative in the decision of Abraham to migrate from Haran to Palestine. There is

absolutely nothing unreasonable in the claim that there existed down to immediately pre-prophetic times written records of this Salem confederacy of monotheists. Our book of Job should have been built upon these records as a foundation.

When then should have lived the author of the present book of Job? Our readers are familiar with the critical opinion which places him as late as 180 B.C., and not earlier than 400 B.C. But this theory has its chief support in scholastic fancy. There seems to be less excuse for this contention than any similar one in the whole list of critical exceptions. Linguistic and collateral arguments are all against it. Since the time of Jerome, scholars have noted the Arabic flavor of the poem. A Bactrian suggestion is also present. Isaiah gives evidence of having read the canonical book; but even with him its literature is archaic. Compare Job xiv. 11 with Isaiah xix. 5, and Job xxvi. 12, 13 with Isaiah li. 9, 10. From these considerations, it would seem certain that the author lived before the time of the earliest writing prophets. Conservative opinion has settled on a date not later than the reign of Solomon; and this is supported by the known relations of the court of Solomon with the Sabeans and other Arabic peoples, the meditative spirit of the Solomonic age which corresponds with the thought in Job, and the Arabic flavor of the writing.

At least two passages in Job testify to the existence previous to the writing of the canonical book of a theocratic law; and by overwhelming implication the law of Moses. The first of these citations occurs at xxii. 22: "Receive, I pray thee, the law from his mouth, and lay up his words in thine heart." Here are words which may be traced to the influence of both the Deuteronomic discourse of Moses on the law and its appraisement in Psalm cxix. The second citation is at xxiii. 12: "Neither have I gone back from the commandment of his lips; I have esteemed the

words of his mouth more than my necessary food." The force of the language used cannot be mistaken; the law and the commandment so extolled came directly from the mouth and lips of Jehovah. It is not an abstract or general principle of law, but the word of Sinai itself.

So far as any problems, alleged or otherwise, attach to the Minor Prophets, which we have not herein considered, the matter does not now concern us. Enough has been brought forward to illustrate our contention regarding the law and prophecy sections of the Old Testament; and also enough to show grounds for holding to the chronological priority of the law. The importance of this order is seen at a glance; it is fundamental; but it none the less calls for study and proof. The sanctity of the canon does not exempt any part of it from the rule. The Word itself invites inquiry, comparison, and test. Reverence and honesty, moral and intellectual, are the abiding conditions of such test.

In view of both the historical and the philosophical aspect of the precedence of the law in the Old Testament, only the most overwhelming contradictory evidence, internal and external, should be admitted. That the dissidence has ignored this, and has proceeded in a manner pragmatic, light, and often frivolous, we believe has been abundantly proved in this Series.

Very many good and devout men have deplored the polemical form into which Old Testament criticism has been cast during the past hundred years; but this has been much in the necessity of the case. It was long ago foreshadowed that the faith once delivered to the saints must at some, or even all, of its stages be earnestly contended for. When once its Armageddon shall have been fought to a close, the thousand years of peace will ensue. We have optimistically held, and, in this final interview with the Old Testament, do now hold, that the day of pragmatism and destructivism is passing. There abides a needed task

of scholarship in restoring and verifying, in certain connections, the Old Testament text, particularly in the Pentateuch. The means for doing this multiply; the task will finally and satisfactorily accomplish itself. There is hope of the discovery of older readings than those now possessed. The extant sources have not been fully drawn upon and compared. Meanwhile, it is to be noted that the discrepancies involved touch no vital or ethical part of the divine laws and teachings. They are verbal and incidental; they are such mistakes and misarrangements as a fallible copyist might fall into. The revision of the Authorized rendering of the New Testament will illustrate what is to be done, what, in fact, is being done, in the Old Testament. The Septuagint version, extant in the time of our Lord and his apostles, and constantly quoted by them, carries certain human defects in its text, as does the King James Version of the New Testament. This fact was, no doubt, known to our Lord and his apostles; but they also knew, as did our fathers concerning the English New Testament, that in the great deep currents of its life it was the absolute, enduring, and inerrant word of God.

One of the evidences of insincerity in the radical type of higher criticism is the constancy and consistency with which it has taken refuge in those variations of Bible texts which are either palpable or proven mistakes of transcription. We early called attention (as had Dr. Kegel previously) to the passage in 2 Samuel viii. 18, in which the Masoretic text refers to the sons of David as *kohen* (*priests*, though the word may as well be translated *princes* or *chief rulers*, as is done in the King James version). Now this may or may not be an error of some copyist; *kohen* may be the original reading, and the writer meant no more nor less than "prince" or "ruler"; but the higher critics have given no shrift to opportunity; no consideration to an alternative lexicographical meaning of the word. The Levitical priesthood must be proved an afterthought in

Israel, and criticism here found a means (though a strangely doubtful one) of doing it. The most was to be made of it.

Both Mr. Wiener and Professor Loehr hold that when the Masoretic text shall have been corrected to conform to the ascertained original, alleged contradictions and the general foothold of destructive criticism will have been eliminated. While this is too technical a matter for the ordinary student to fully enter into, it yet indicates the path of a certain confidence, and becomes a means of steadying individual faith in the integrity of the Book. The Book will fulfill itself. Furthermore, the situation, even in the midst of the still ascending smoke of battle, is such that both teacher and student may be sure that the record is trustworthy and self-defensible. Bible science is a thing quite apart from Bible ethics and Bible theology. The law, the prophecies, and the gospel are the jewels within the casket of Scripture. Certain scratches and frayings on the outside of the casket give occasion for Bible science, so-called; but the jewels within are not involved in, or affected by, such humanlike methods.

As a finality, we may confidently assert that conservative scholarship everywhere will accept the traditional order of law and prophecy, not only as a canonical sequence, but as a settled fundamental of criticism, as a question not again to be opened. What therefore remains are the matters of text research discussed above; the legitimate study of national accretions to the original bodies of Hebrew literature, and the possible correction of transcriptional misarrangement of certain phrases, sentences, and, it may be, a passage here and there, as better approved readings may indicate. But, again, not one, nor all, of such corrections in prospect can alter the tenor of Biblical history or subtract from the canon a single tenet of doctrine or precept of righteousness.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 10

The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord

By
JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1926

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 10.—"The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord," by John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 11.—"The Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ," by the Editor.

Number 12.—"The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ," by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER TEN.

The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord.

BY JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

With Introduction by the Editor.

X.

INTRODUCTION.

THE historical criticism of the New Testament, so far as any serious problems of dating and authorship are concerned, is a closed chapter. At the beginning of the present century two or three of the books of the canon were still, more or less, in the weighing; but these, at last, have won fairly and permanently in the contest. So far is this true that it is not probable that the question of the authenticity of any New Testament book ever again will become crucial.

Textual criticism, as it has affected the New Testament, has shared in the experience of the contest over historical questions. The crest of difficulty was long ago left behind. But the textual problems of the New Testament have never been complex; nor have they given rise to a great diversity of judgments. The path has been natural, if not always easy. With the gathering together, during the last century, of a mass of middle-century manuscripts, uncial and cursive, majuscule and minuscule, with the old Syriac and Latin, the Vaticanus, the Alexandrine, and the Sinaiticus (discovered by Tischendorf in 1844), scholars have had a complete working basis for recovering the original text. The results in such approved corrections and arrangements as those by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tragelles, and Westcott and Hort, not to mention other distinguished workers in this field, inspire the belief that we have the Greek text in practically its original form and detail. One can readily see how immeasurably advantaged in this particular the New Testament is over the Old.

But reassuring as are the results in New Testament criticism, they do not describe a complete victory. While,

from whatever credal viewpoint moving, reputable scholarship has been forced to surrender to the historical and literary integrity of the New Testament; while the Book stands, and must continue to stand, validated in its entirety by all the canons of criticism; there is yet left out of the question considerations of inspiration, doctrinal inerrancy, and supernaturalism. The Book is indorsed as a writing within the letter of its own claim; but the field is left open for a new contest. The old critical onset becomes a scholastic attack, having as its objective the discounting of the letter and even the spirit of the cardinal doctrines of the gospel. This new form of the conflict is now on in full force. The battle cry is no longer the Canon, but the Confession. The supreme issue is not faith in the historic Man of Galilee, but in the superhuman Christ. The Life is not denied. It is admitted, wondered at, and, it may be, rejoiced in; but the Life plus its miraculous beginning is subtly dealt with, disparaged, and rejected. The ethical evangel is underwritten, extolled; but the overtopping insistence of the atoning sacrifice is reasoned into the sentimentality of a self-chosen martyrdom. The psychic resurgence of the Galilean Soul is made a tenet of faith; but the death and grave-conquering return of the Body through the Resurrection is denied. In a word, although the canon of the New Testament has won over all objection, the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection are not to be permitted to retain the place given them by revelation and history in the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

It is to be noted that, with the exception of a school of limited membership, the assailants of the elemental doctrines of Christianity have given up even the old and long-asserted theory of an interpolated record, the myth and tendency hypothesis, as also the charge of a self-deceived apostolic community, and have boldly undertaken to explain away the verity and majesty of "the word

spoken by angels" and believed on through a thousand ages. It is a contest to which the spirits of might are to be called until the consummation of victory.

It has been foreshadowed in the discussions that have gone before in this Series that the section allotted to the discussion of New Testament themes is not to take into general account any of the fought over and finished critical issues in either the historical or textual field; but that the whole space would be given to an answer to the attacks which have been made upon the cardinal and cognate doctrines of the gospel. The present state of thought in the Churches indicates the need for such concentrated discussion. The whole field of this special inquiry will be brought into effective review in the treatment of the three climacteric subjects announced, the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection.

The brochure of Dr. Faulkner which is being presented in this Introduction deals, in a calm, effective, and convincing manner, with the record and doctrine of the miraculous Birth of our Lord. This is the first and foremost doctrine of the New Testament. With our own view, expressed above, agrees the observation of Dr. Faulkner of the opportuneness of this discussion. A recrudescence of semi-Arianism and all but naked Unitarianism now manifesting itself has doubly emphasized the correctness of the observation. An age of haste and surface thinking, such as ours, is peculiarly exposed to the invasion of strong and insidious error. Only the terms of a heroic remedy can be successfully applied to such a condition. That remedy we are seeking to apply in these studies.

Was our Lord conceived by the Holy Ghost; was he Virgin born; was he the incarnate, eternal Son of God? Or was he the natural son of Joseph the Carpenter, who in some undescribed, and to us unthinkable, way became the Son of God? We hazard nothing when we say that the gospel, not only as a saving message for the spiritual

and bodily life of the world, but also as an enduring ethical teaching, must stand or fall on the answer made to these questions. Again, we hazard nothing in saying that the Virgin Birth is inseparable from any idea of an incarnation that could possibly bring into a personal human consciousness "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." A racial Messiah, or even the founder of a universal cult, might be thinkable without the miracle of the Virgin Birth; but the Christ of redemption—never.

New converts and catechumens might be brought into saving relation with Christ, as were many of the early Church disciples, without detailed understanding of the theology of the Birth; but it becomes an intellectual axiom that a teaching and world-conquering confidence in the gospel is not possible without faith in, and knowledge of, the Virgin Birth and that which it validates and makes vital. In whatever treatment of this subject they may undertake, philosophy and science must accept this axiom as absolute. The miraculous Birth may be denied; the world, as a whole, may be brought to reject it, but without it the Christ of the prophecies and the evangel is inconceivable. But men who do deny the miraculous Birth conceive of Christ. Yes; but as pensioners, as parvenus, in the house of knowledge and faith built by others. A Christ out of the loins of Joseph is a hold-over memory, a mere phantasm of faith and thinking.

The gospel is both a statement and an experience of facts. The facts are not speculative or incidental, but fundamental, indispensable, eternal. The doctrine of the miraculous Birth is not a matter to be determined by the processes of the individual intellect; it is the attested, transmitted fact on which the gospel stands. As easily could cosmos exist without creation, sunlight without the sun, as the Evangel without the miraculous Birth. Unitarianism is to religious experience what the pulmotor is to an expiring human body. The pulmotor may prolong

mechanical breathing; but it can neither originate human life, nor perpetuate its phenomena. Unitarianism may stimulate certain ethical impulses and ideals which have the semblance of spiritual life; but it can neither create that life nor send it forward to a great evangelical end. The hybrid theology in the evangelical Churches of to-day which seeks a middle ground between Unitarianism and Nicene orthodoxy, in holding Godhood in the offspring of the Carpenter Joseph, has the abysm of infinite nonsense for its footing.

It becomes a serious question as to how far search may be made for the motive of the neo-Socinianism of our day, the party diversion against the traditional and orthodox doctrine of the miraculous Birth. It is not enough to say that it is wholly sinister, though that might approximate the fact. Nor can any logical ground be proposed that does not beg the question and bankrupt the argument. What then? Conviction forces the conclusion that the whole concept comes, at bottom, from a superficial spiritual apprehension and a personal and confluent compromise of the higher loyalties of discipleship. This is plain speech; but truth and frankness are interchangeable terms.

Just when the complete knowledge of the fact of the Virgin Birth came to the first disciples of the Lord is not now known; but it cannot be sanely doubted that had that faith and knowledge not come the gospel could not have crossed the boundaries of Palestine, and had never been heard of as the dominant spiritual force of the world. It was faith in the Virgin Birth that wrote the Apostles' Creed in its earliest norm, somewhere near 100 A.D.; that forged the tremendous phrases and enduring symbols of the Nicene Confession, created the Patristic literature, conquered both Jewish fanaticism and pagan indifference, climbed to power on the throne of the Cæsars, and drew on the destinies of the ages and millenniums to come.

It is not the single memory of the Babe in the cradle of Bethlehem, but the double memory of the Babe and his miraculous Birth that turns the soul of the world forever toward the Manger. It is not alone the agony of the garden, nor the orgy of the cross, that holds the faith of the world to the Crucified; but these linked with "God manifest in the flesh." God was behind and in the Birth; God was behind and in the Sacrifice. This is the testimony of Godhood itself. Who shall oppose to it the dictum of a groping biological obsession? Without the setting of the miraculous Birth, faith in the Incarnation must subtend the subtleties of a scholastic fancy; and the soul which seeks the Christ amid such vacuity must cry: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

Dr. Faulkner has so analyzed and indexed the parts of his cogent discussion that the reader will not fail to follow him. The outline of his treatment covers the entirety of the subject; and not only presents the several issues in clear relief, but opens the way for the diligent student to fill in and complete the exhibit of proofs and relations. He best instructs his readers who leads them into independent and continuous processes with the matter of his writing. This character of exercise and self-direction is woefully wanting at the present time. Multitudes, even of those who possess the means of self-correction, are being blindly misled of a heresy of which they perceive little except the glamour of its intellectual enticement. This is at once the hope and the peril of this New Testament situation. Christianity is seeing repeated to-day the experiences of its old-time doctrinal aberrations. This is a process of history. It must needs be that offenses come; but the kingdom of truth and testimony proceeds along its appointed course, what time the critics rage and their broodlings imagine a vain thing.

The plea for tolerance and the right of individual think-

ing made by the chief offenders in the present heretical diversion in the Churches is both ill-timed and specious. Tolerance and thought license are terms with implied limitations. These limitations are determined by the subjects involved and their relation to the organizations which have undertaken to teach and promote them. Within these limitations, license and privilege cease, so far as regards community law. In an orthodox Church whose faith is determined by the Apostles' Creed and the teachings of the New Testament, a denial of the Virgin Birth leaves no ground for a plea in abatement of the obligations imposed by subscription. Antinomianism in every form and denial of the essential spirituality of the operative gospel have heretofore claimed toleration and hospitality in Church fellowship. History doubtless is preparing to repeat itself. The miraculous Birth is the container of the divine doctrines. It is not a question of toleration and private interpretation as to whether or not men in orthodox orders shall crush that container and toss it away at will. It is a question of the preservation of the truth.

I am aware that this line of discussion does not belong properly to a purely critical engagement; but it is so important an integer in the controversy now vexing the life of the Evangelical Churches that it would be a remissness not to bring it forward at this time. What is to be done? Just what we are seeking to do; what Dr. Faulkner has done in the following pages: earnestly contend for the truth once for all delivered to the saints. It is a modern occasion for invoking the rule of the parable of the tares and wheat. The wheat life of faith must go on in growth and seed-bearing, waiting for the natural and logical judgment of Spirit-directed time. We must give this heresy time to finish its course.

Dr. Faulkner scarcely needs introduction to readers of current theological literature in America. To Methodist

readers he is particularly well known. Many of his former pupils are in our denominational pulpits, North and South. Dr. Faulkner fills the Chair of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary. He made important contributions to the Church history edited by the late Bishop Hurst; and has written not a few other historical sketches and books on theological and kindred subjects, amongst which are "The Methodists," "Cyprian," and "Erasmus." We have long regarded him as one of the soundest and ablest scholars in America. We have particularly esteemed him to be fitted to discuss the preëminent doctrine of the Miraculous Birth of Our Lord.

THE MIRACULOUS BIRTH OF OUR LORD.

1. How the Controversy Arose.

With the exception of a portion of the Ebionites in the second century, of whom later, it was—speaking generally—the universal belief of the Christian Church from the beginning to modern times that our Lord Jesus Christ was born miraculously—that is, by the Holy Spirit without the aid of the father. Of course the German rationalists of the seventeenth century and the English Deists of the close of the seventeenth and of the eighteenth century rejected the Birth (to save space I shall use the word Birth with capital as synonymous with Miraculous or Virgin Birth), but they rejected other miracles as well, so that their denial was taken for granted. All who received Christianity as a divine religion and the Bible as a divine revelation took the Birth as a matter of course. But there came over into German Christianity an influence here that was disastrous. Kant the philosopher, who tried to lay a foundation for religion in the "practical" reason, really took away with one hand what he gave with the other, as he denied the supernatural and therefore the Christian religion. Schleiermacher, though an eminent Christian teacher, felt the rationalistic age-spirit (*Zeitgeist*), and declared against miracle, which he said destroyed the whole connection of nature[1] (though it does not). By these two Ritschl, without denying the possibility of miracle and occasionally speaking hopefully, was deeply touched, and so leaves the matter vague and "up in the air,"[2] and his school has bettered their master on the negative side. And therefore Schrempf, when he

[1]Schleiermacher, "*Glaubenslehre*," I., Sec. 47.

[2]Orr, "The Ritschlian Theology," 91-93.

went among them to get training in Tübingen, lost his early faith and was made ready for his later action. He became pastor at Leuzendorf in Württemberg. As such he had to baptize, and at that service the Church law compelled him to ask the godfathers or candidates this question: "Let us now take upon ourselves the confession of the holy faith: we believe in God the Father Almighty [and the rest of the Apostles' Creed]. Do you desire, then, to have this child baptized upon this faith, and upon the ground of the same Christianly and savingly trained?" But Schrempf's "liberal" education in theology had made even parts (Birth, bodily resurrection, etc.) of this modest creed impossible, and in 1891 he substituted this question: "Do you desire to have this child baptized unto our Saviour Jesus Christ, and Christianly and savingly trained in faith in him?" He publicly explained and defended his course. As this change was against the law of the State Church of Württemberg, the matter went into the ecclesiastical courts, and minister Schrempf in 1892 was thrown out of his pastorate.[3]

The village pastor found himself world-famous. Presses teemed with pamphlets on the Apostles' Creed. In the last half of 1892 forty or fifty treatises appeared on the subject in Germany, and as that country then set the theological pace these books and pamphlets were ordered by other countries and some even translated. His students asked the Ritschlian historian Harnack to give a public judgment on the Creed, especially whether it should be made obligatory in acts of worship. In his reply he made special objection to "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," for here, he said, something is asserted which is unbelievable to many believing Christians, and no change of meaning of this

[3] *Die Christliche Welt*, August 18, 1892, 759 ff., also Schrempf's own pamphlet, "*Akten zu meiner Entlassung*," u.s.w., 1892 (56 pages).

clause such as other clauses have undergone can be allowed, because the only change here must be a change into its opposite. Here is a real embarrassment to every upright Christian who wishes to use the Creed and yet is not convinced of this clause.[4] Harnack followed this with a pamphlet on the Creed itself, its history, etc.; and this, as I said, was the beginning of a mighty flood and the start (1892) of the modern discussions of the Birth of Jesus. And they have kept up to this hour.

2. Is the Question Important?

It is a favorite position of many that while it is important to know who Jesus was, it is of no importance to know how he came to be. His words and works verify himself, but not his origin. Now it is true that Christianity grew and could only have grown by preaching Jesus as he was in adult life as Saviour and Lord, his words and his deeds. The question of his origin would not immediately arise. But it was bound to arise. The crucial thing in Christianity both among Jews and Gentiles was not God the Father—all religions were equally concerned with him—but was Jesus Christ. Who is he? Where did he come from? What did he do? Is he a prophet or is he the Son of God, who with the Father is to be praised and worshiped? Our religion hung on that. From the first he was looked upon as divine. I cannot stop to prove this now, but it is true.[5] This brought up his origin. Notice, the story of his origin was not invented to prove him divine, because necessarily in a missionary age the historical Christ himself would be preached, and that Christ proved himself and was proved divine first, and thus he was received and men became

[4] "*In Sachen des Apostolikums*," in *Christliche Welt*, 1892, 769.

[5] See the appropriate chapters in Faulkner, "Modernism and the Christian Faith," 2d edition, 1922.

Christians. There was no necessity therefore for inventing his Birth to prove what was universally believed. But the facts as to his origin were bound to come out. By and by a more or less full systematic life of him would be written. It was written. It was found that the Birth fitted the Life and the Words and the End, and all fitted the already received doctrine. You could hardly imagine the contrary. But imagine it. It is discovered by our evangelists that Jesus, who is worshiped as Lord by every congregation established by the time the Gospels were written, was the offspring of the premature passion of a Galilean carpenter. Think of the disappointment, the chagrin, perhaps the rage, of thousands of disillusioned converts. "Who is this? We thought we were worshiping the Son of God, eternal Saviour and Lord, who came from the Father to save us. But we find in the thing which determines his being, that is, his origin, he is just like all the rest of us, a mere man. We have all been idolaters. Out with such a contemptible heathenism!" Yes, the question of his origin is important. Perhaps it is all-important.

This means also that the Birth was not brought in, as an eminent writer alleges,[6] to explain the Person of Christ. It was told as it was found, naïvely and simply, as a fact. It was not presented in the New Testament as having doctrinal bearing, whether on Logos (the "Word"), the "Two Natures," or anything else. History has made us interested in these discussions, as the first witnesses were not and could not be. When the facts came out, they fitted the beliefs of the Church on Christ, but that was a coincidence, not an intention.

3. The Old Testament.

It was the constant preaching of Christ and the apostles that they were carrying out the principles of the Old

[6]S. Mathews, "The Gospel and the Modern Man," 1910.

Testament, that though they corrected imperfect parts of that earlier development they stood upon its platform and reproclaimed its truths. Messiah, salvation, justification by faith, regeneration, universality of the Gospel, God as Father—everything was in the old covenant; if not in fullness, yet in germ. But there was one exception —the non-paternal Birth. There were indeed cases of divine quickening where those barren or past age received power, and these might be considered foregleams of that one Birth for which all others were made; but they, after all, were with the coöperation of the father, and so not miraculous in the New Testament sense. Neither in the Old nor New Testament was there anything approaching asceticism, the thought of anything unworthy or unholy in the slightest degree in marriage, procreation, etc. Priests, prophets, apostles, were married; priests came in a line of descent; "blessed is the man whose quiver is full of" children (Ps. cxxvii. 5); even John the Baptist, though he was born through special answer to prayer when natural signs were unfavorable (Luke i. 7, 13) and was spiritually endowed before birth (verse 15), came as to origin in the natural way (verse 13). The nearest approach to the monastic principle in the New Testament is Christ's words in Matthew xix. 12 and Paul's advices in view of the "distress that is upon us" (1 Cor. vii. 26); and space will not allow discussion. It is indeed true that we have the famous passage in Isaiah vii. 14, which Matthew brings forward as corroborating the Birth and a prophecy of it (i. 22, 23). But it is universally agreed by scholars that the Hebrew word translated "virgin" means a young woman of marriageable age (the regular Hebrew word for "virgin" being another), so that we cannot build an exclusive reference on the Hebrew. The Septuagint (Greek) version of Isaiah had *parthenos*, "virgin," and it was that which Matthew had in mind. We must remember also that Matthew looked upon the Old Testa-

ment as full of Christ, anticipating him at almost any turn; and that though he was justified in this use pedagogically, didactically, and religiously, and as a tribute to the far-reaching spiritual shadowings forth of that Testament, he was not always justified scientifically—that is, as to the immediate reference of the passage, especially in its original Hebrew text.[7] Like many another truth, the New Testament climaxes the Old with a new glory also in the Birth.

4. The Witness of Luke.

Critics are generally agreed that Luke's Gospel is fairly early: Blass, 55-60; Harnack, 78-93; others, 70-85. It is supposed to be composed of a Marcan document, Logia or Discourses, oral tradition, and special narratives like the infancy stories. It is written in a workmanlike way, in excellent Greek, so much so that Professor Hayes of Garrett Biblical Institute has published a little treatise on it under the title, "The Most Beautiful Book in the World" (1913). Its author was for that age a man of scientific training, and—not speaking of divine aid—took his task conscientiously. It was his deliberate purpose, he says, to trace matters accurately and to set them out in order (i. 3). Where means are left for checking up his statements scholars have found that his claim is well founded, even strikingly so. He says that in the sixth month Gabriel the angel was sent to Nazareth in Galilee to a virgin betrothed to Joseph of the house of David. He greeted her with, "Hail, thou endowed-with-grace one, the Lord (is) with thee." The salutation perplexed her. He immediately reassured her by telling her not to fear, as she had found grace with God, and added: "Thou shalt conceive in womb and shalt bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great and shall be called

[7]See Thorburn, "Virgin Birth," pages 144-148, and the long and admirable comment of H. A. W. Meyer, on Matthew i. 22, 23.

the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David his father, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob unto the ages, and of his kingdom there shall not be end." Mary did not falter with her reply: "How is this? for I know not a man." Gabriel again reassured her: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and power of Highest shall shadow thee over; therefore that Holy Thing to be born shall be called Son of God." Then he told of her relative Elisabeth's happy fate, the future mother of the forerunner John, and added, "Every saying from God shall not at all be powerless." Mary closed by saying, "Behold the slave of the Lord. Be it unto me according to thy saying" (i. 26-38.)

That this was a proclamation of a miraculous (non-paternal) Birth has been—as far as I know—the opinion of critics of all schools, though in January, 1923, a theologian came out with the theory that the angel intended to announce only an ordinary birth, with special divine qualification of the mother.[8] This is excluded by the frank confession of Mary in verse 34 and the equally frank reply to that confession in verse 35, with the additional facts that the child was to be holy and the Son of God, which to Jewish ears would mean much more than to ours. Radical critics get rid of the witness of Luke by alleging an interpolation of the verses. If there were good manuscript evidence of the omission, this would be welcome to all, for none of us is concerned to find in the New Testament unnecessary miracles, in which in fact God is an economist. And it is true that there is one Latin manuscript of the fourth or fifth century which omits verse 34 and substitutes a part of verse 38, but a reading which has all manuscripts except one, and that a second-rate one, is practically unanimous. But even so this Latin version still keeps verse 35, so that the super-

[8]Lewis, in *Methodist Review*, N. Y., January, 1923, page 117.

natural character of the narrative is witnessed with absolute unanimity. The probability is that the translator stumbled at Mary's question as arguing a want of faith on her part, and so omitted it. It is also true that the Protevangelium, a false Gospel of the second or third century, omits our verse 34, substituting a paraphrase with a different meaning; but this Gospel does not profess to be an accurate copy of a real Gospel, but its own story, and the omission is due either to carelessness or (more probably) to thinking verse 34 inconsistent with the childlike piety of Mary. The Acts of Thomas (second century) represent Jesus and Thomas as twin brothers, looking so much alike that even animals could not distinguish them; but this book was the invention of a heretical sect whose fantastic ideas no more invalidate the Birth than those of the Docetæ do the Resurrection. These objections to the Lucan account, which radicals like F. C. Conybeare have seized hold of, are flimsy indeed over against the unanimous solidity of Luke's Greek text. It is open for us to say that Luke had no regard for truth, or lugged in false documents, but it is not open to receive his Gospel and then reject parts on subjective presuppositions, or on critical grounds that are worthless.

Though Luke was a Gentile of culture, all critics are agreed that his first and second chapters are bathed in a Jewish atmosphere, redolent of Jewish customs and phrases, echoing Old Testament passages, the sections worked in and bound together in a masterly way, and the whole set forth with a beauty, spiritual illumination, and almost splendor never surpassed. The question arises whether these sections (say those known in Church History from words occurring in their Latin translations as the Benedictus, i. 68-79, Magnificat, i. 46-55, Nunc Dimittis, ii. 29-32, as well as the Annunciation to Mary, i. 28, 30-33, 35-38, the Song of Elisabeth, i. 42-45, the Annunciation to Zacharias, i. 13-17) were composed by

Luke himself from materials he had received from Mary or her circle, or were Hebrew or Aramaic documents he had received from the same hands carried over into his own Greek. Von Harnack thinks they are due to the creative genius of Luke himself; but how could a Gentile catch without superfluous miracle the very temper, tone, living voice, and poetic inspiration of devout Jews of those earlier and Palestinian years? Sanday argues for Aramaic documents underlying these chapters, and I have been impressed by his points.[9] Briggs, the eminent scholar of Union Theological Seminary, New York, discovered seven pieces of Hebrew poetry in these chapters and even their original meters—six trimeters, one pentameter—and that they are parts of two poems of the infancy current among the relatives of Jesus after his resurrection, one of which poems was used by Luke and the other by Matthew.[10] Luke's story is "nothing more than a prose setting for the seven poetic pieces given to him," and were historical sources of the highest value. I doubt whether Luke i. 13-17 and Matthew i. 20, 21 are poetry, but I do not doubt that there is considerable truth in the theories of Sanday and Briggs.

It has also been pointed out that there are several female touches in these two Lucan chapters, little items of reality which only a woman would think of. Luke's historical sense and veracity sought out sources from that Mary circle, poems of praise which Mary herself wrote from her own memory perhaps, possibly not long after the events, and he incorporated these in his Gospel with the information handed down by Mary and her friends, some of whom were known by Paul and Luke. But the whole story is told by the latter with exquisite taste, with words full of sacred associations, and experts say that no part of his Gospel—not even the Parable of the Prodigal

[9] "Critical Questions," 1903.

[10] "New Light on the Life of Jesus," pages 162 ff.

Son—"is written with greater felicity of diction than the story of the Nativity."[11] Whatever the literary sources of the story, internal evidence shows that it was derived in the last resort from her who best knew its truth. The researches of critics whose independence is involved in their honesty and honor, like von Harnack, Ramsay, Chase (I do not mean to assert agreement in every detail), have abundantly confirmed Luke's trustworthiness, and there are neither logical nor historical reasons for withdrawing his first two chapters from the presumption which that fact brings with it.

5. The Witness of Matthew.

The Gospel of St. Matthew, written for Jewish Christians about A.D. 70, approaches the Birth from another angle. It says that Christ's mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph, that before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Spirit, that Joseph, because a good man and not wishing to cause her any scandal, thought of quietly letting her go, that when pondering the matter an angelic manifestation in a dream assured him that he need have no fear of completing the engagement with a full marriage inasmuch as that which was begotten of her was of the Holy Spirit, that the child was to be a son, and that his name should be called Jesus (Joshua, "saviour"), because he should save his people from their sins. The evangelist adds that all this happens to fulfill Isaiah vii. 14, which he quotes in the Septuagint version. Then Joseph in due time takes Mary as his wife, but "knows her not" till she had brought forth a son, who was called Jesus (i. 18-25).

Here is evidently another story from Jewish Christian sources, which springs ultimately from Joseph himself,

[11] "The Virgin Birth of Christ," in *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1904, 196. Sanday thinks that through Joanna we have the link between Mary and Luke. See Luke viii. 3, xxiv. 10.

as that in Luke does from Mary, and both supplement without contradicting each other. I shall speak later of the readings of the Sinai Syriac manuscript. Suffice it to say now: (1) No one doubts that the first Gospel represents the Birth as miraculous. (2) Nor does any one doubt that the account is entirely independent of Luke's. Here two divergent and distinct traditions sustain each other as to the main fact. But independence does not mean contradiction. Lobstein's criticism here is too subjective.[12] The narratives spring from different traditions, one from the Mary circle, the other the Joseph, representing historical events in which each was interested, but these events supplement without opposing each other, show that each series meets and harmonizes in the central fact in which each is interested—viz., that the Birth is as divine as the Child, and thus without intending to do so lend one impression to what came to be the Gospel history of Jesus. In American history Bancroft approaches the Revolution along the political way, Schlesinger along the economic, so much so that you would almost think one author denied the causes of the other, but both unite in the chief fact which occupies them, the Revolution itself. Exactly so with Luke and Matthew as to the Birth.

I have already said that Matthew's use of Isaiah vii. 14 is not to be interpreted according to modern scientific principles, but by his general scheme of looking at the Old Testament as full of intimations of Messiah. Our knowledge that the direct reference may be something else does not invalidate his knowledge that a religious reference may be to the Christ. The mere fact of virginity was of no significance in Judaism, which had an altogether too healthy conception of human relations to become sponsor for the sickly asceticism of the third and later centuries of our era out of which sprang the mighty monastic

[12]Lobstein, "The Virgin Birth of Christ," 1903, 42.

development. For that reason the primitive Church would have taken for granted as the most natural thing in the world the ordinary paternity of Mary's later children and her having them as enhancing her honor. Far from it being true, therefore, that the "legend" of the Birth was suggested by Isaiah i. 14, Dalman says well that "no trace is to be found among the Jews of any Messianic application of Isaiah's words concerning the virgin's Son from which by any possibility—as some have maintained—the whole account of the Miraculous Birth of Jesus could have derived its origin."[13] It is just as the historian Neander says that such a story could have arisen anywhere else easier than among the Jews. Matthew's witness comes therefore with all the greater historical cogency as to a tradition already thoroughly established in spite of an uncongenial atmosphere, and could avail itself of the prophetic foreshadowing of the Septuagint translation of Isaiah vii. 14, his very use of which implies the Birth as taken for granted.

Where did Matthew get his account? (I purposely leave out theories of inspiration or origin from above, and assume in the New Testament writers honesty only.) I think Gore's suggestion is as likely to be as true as any. Assuming that Joseph was a "just man" and that he died before our Lord entered his public ministry, it is to be further assumed that he would want to clear up the circumstances of the birth of Jesus and thus vindicate his wife's virginity. If the Birth was ever to be made public in its right relations, he must have thought his own testimony was needed. It is likely, therefore, that he left a document to this effect, which he gave to Mary, and which later was handed on through the Lord's "brothers" until finally it reached Matthew.[14]

---

[13]"The Words of Jesus," trans., 276.

[14]Gore, "Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation," 1895, 28.

6. The Famous Reading of Sinaitic Syriac.

In 1892 Mrs. Lewis (widow of Rev. S. S. Lewis, Anglican) discovered and took photographs of an ancient Syriac text (translation) of our four Gospels at the monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai. In 1893 she and other experts went back to the convent and transcribed the whole manuscript, which she published with an English translation in 1894. This palimpsest (for over the Gospels had been written the lives of female saints) goes back to about 400, perhaps a few years earlier, but represents a Syraic text much older, perhaps 150-200. We cannot go into the interesting deviations of this version from the early Greek texts, but can only speak of its readings in our subject.[15] It changes from the Greek in Matthew i. 16 so that it reads: "Jacob begat Joseph; *Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus,* who is called Christ" (variations in italic). Matthew i. 21: "For she shall bear *thee* a son." Matthew i. 25: "And he married his wife, and she bare *him* a son, and he called his name Jesus." Outside of these changes, however, the whole miraculous story as given in i. 18-25 is correctly reproduced in Syriac.

This is certainly interesting. What is the solution? Radical critics like F. C. Conybeare explain that it was the original text which denied the Birth, that that original text is correctly represented in these three translations as italicized above, and that the ordinary text has been tampered with for "orthodox" purposes. The only argument of any value he brings forward is that one manuscript of an ancient Latin version (*k*, cursive, fourth and fifth century) omits, "and he knew her not until." Will you stand a pyramid on its apex? All the original manuscripts of the Gospel, all the early versions, give the ordi-

[15]See the admirable article by Farrar in *Expositor*, London, 5th series, volume I., article i.

nary reading—only this Syriac version of about 400 has changed some of the readings, and a Latin version of about the same time has omitted another. This last may be due to the working of the ascetic principle, the translator or copyist thinking that there must be some mistake in the hint that Mary had other children by Joseph after her first-born and therefore thought he would "restore" the text to its original form. It is much more likely that the scribe of the Syriac Sinai text was an Adoptionist (one of an ancient sect who believed—at least some of them did—that Christ was the natural son of Joseph, that on account of his holiness, fidelity, etc., he was adopted as God's Son, a form of which teaching has been revived by German "liberal" theologians of the nineteenth century and from them has gone widely among ministers in evangelical Churches), and had the boldness to tamper with his text in two or three instances, but did not have the face to carry his changes through consistently, and so allowed the bulk of the narrative to stand, to silently contradict his revisions. In this way a scribe in ascetic interest inserted "fasting" in Matthew xvii. 21, Mark ix. 29, 1 Corinthians vii. 5, Acts x. 30, but did not venture to change Matthew ix. 14, 15, Mark ii. 18, 19, Luke v. 33, and Colossians ii. 21-23. To make the whole section Adoptionist, we should have to "reduce it to shreds," as J. Rendel Harris says. Even the Curetonian Syriac text has the ordinary reading in Matthew i. 16 and 25. We can remake our New Testament text against the practical unanimity of all original authorities, we can prefer a single reading due to the theological idiosyncrasy of a fourth or fifth century scribe, as do some of our radical critics, but let us confess that we do so from our presuppositions, and not from scientific criticism. We are free on account of the former to deny the Birth; we are not free on account of the latter to deny that the Gospels teach it.

7. New Theory of a Natural-Supernatural Birth.

To account for his retaining the supernatural story along with his own changes (as we consider them) in the natural interest, F. C. Conybeare has revived what he calls a Jewish view at the time of Christ which he discovered in the works of the Jewish Alexandrian philosopher and theologian, Philo. The theory is that a child may be begotten according to man as to its body and faculties of sense and according to God as to its soul and reason. He quotes Philo as saying that man is a being compounded of earthy substance and divine spirit. The Artist took clay and fashioned the body; the soul, however, he made directly. So Sarah became pregnant to God, though she brought forth to Abraham.[16] Conybeare thinks that the sacred writer may have had the view that Jesus came naturally as to his body and lower mental faculties and supernaturally as to his spirit. I am sorry that such an ingenious theory is not better supported. For (1) Philo is advocating only the common theory of birth, called the Creationist as over against the Traducian, by which the soul of every man comes at first hand from the Creator, and of which echoes are voiced by modern poets as in the well-known words in the greatest single brief achievement in English literature since Milton, Wordsworth's "Ode to Immortality," and in Tennyson's

> "A soul shall draw from out the vast,
> And strike its being into bounds,"

and in his "Crossing the Bar,"

> "When that which drew from out the boundless deep
> Turns again home."

And (2) in the passages on Sarah, Leah, etc., Philo does

[16] F. C. Conybeare, in *Academy* (London), November 17, 1894, quoted in full by Thorburn, "Doctrine of the Virgin Birth," 10-13.

not mean to assert a double birth or deny the natural participation of the male, any more than Luke does in the case of the birth of John the Baptist. Indeed the growth of a legend of supernatural birth would not have been surprising in the latter case, and the fact that it never happened shows that the sacred writers did not invent unnecessary miracles. Besides Matthew i. 18-25 shows that Joseph had no more idea of such a birth as Conybeare has in mind than he had of the birth of Minerva from the head of Jupiter. Then, the apostles were Galileans, literalists, opposed to all Greek tendencies and Philonic speculations, of which they knew nothing. Whatever influence Philo had in Alexandria, he had none in Palestine, and anything like a miraculous conception of the Logos or Messiah was entirely foreign to him. Matthew tells a straightforward story with Jewish directness, a Birth mysterious and divine yet literally true.[17]

8. The Genealogies.

It was universally believed in the early Church that Christ was of the line of David, and it was not denied by his enemies (comp. Luke i. 32, Rom. i. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 8). The genealogies therefore did not have as their main function the proving of that fact, but the proving that Joseph, known to be of that line, was the legal husband of Mary and legally and socially fathered the Child whom his enemies had branded as illegitimate. The Matthew genealogy (i. 1-16) "meets that slander by giving a bird's-eye view of the movement of the history from Abraham to the Messiah in the form of a genealogy of Joseph, who in the light of all the facts concerning the origin of Jesus marries Mary and gives her the protection of his stainless name and royal lineage. The extraordinary boldness and brilliancy of this apologetic ought not to be overlooked.

[17]See remarks of Thorburn, 34-38.

The formal charge that Jesus is the son of Mary, not of Joseph, is admitted—the slander involved being refuted by bringing Joseph forward as a witness for Mary. Nothing could have been more natural for a man fearless in the confidence of truth; nothing could have been more impossible for one insecure in his hold upon the facts"[18]—that is, not the minute correctness of the genealogical line as such, in which the author has no special interest and therefore artificially groups the lists, omits and includes, and brings in names of women and brothers, but the facts as to the *historical movement* of the genealogy as showing the origin, power, decay, and downfall of the house of David, and the facts of the Child's Birth sponsored by Joseph.

The genealogy of Luke (iii. 23-38) is independent of Matthew's, ascends the stream, and though ostensibly of Joseph, yet Godet shows strong reasons to believe it is also of Mary. Sweet, who has given expert attention to this matter both in his great book on the Birth and in his Encyclopedia article, thinks that the difficulties are removed and facts harmonized "by the simple supposition that Luke has given us the meeting-point of the lineage both of Joseph and Mary, who are akin. This explains the apparent choice of Joseph's list, the peculiar position of his name in that list, the reversal of the order, the coincidences and discrepancies with respect to Matthew's, the early tradition of Mary's Davidic origin, the strange reference in the Talmud (Haggadha lxxvii. 4) to Mary as the daughter of Heli, the visit of Mary with Joseph to Bethlehem at the time of the registration, and the traditional discrepancy of ages between Joseph and Mary, such that (apparently) Joseph disappears from the scene before Jesus reaches maturity."[19]

---

[18]L. M. Sweet, "Genealogy of Jesus Christ," in "International Standard Bible Encyclopædia," 1915, II, 1196-97.

[19]*Ibid.*, 1198.

As to the Birth, that is the very thing the Gospels bring in the genealogies for, and it will be a far distant day when the hope of yet-to-be-discovered manuscripts will gladden the hearts of critics by assuring them that our Matthew and Luke really taught the physical participation of Joseph and have been worked over in the supernatural interest. "An author who knew how to make even the dry material of a genealogy to its least detail contribute to the purpose of his thought concerning the slandered miracle of Messiah's birth cannot at the same time have taken over statements from a genealogy of Joseph or Jesus used by him which directly contradicted his conception of this fact. Any text in Matthew which contained such statements would be condemned in advance as one altered against the author's interest."[20] Even W. C. Allen, who started with the historically untenable view that the Sinai Syraic more nearly represents the original (for the nearest language to the apostles and first believers after Aramaic or Hebrew was not Syriac, but Greek, in which their first Gospels would naturally be written), came round to the conclusion of Zahn that the first Gospel from the beginning taught the Virgin Birth.[21]

9. Joseph's Son.

Much is made of the fact that the genealogies are of Joseph, that Joseph is mentioned as a matter of course as Christ's father, which means, it is said, that he was his physical father. (This even deceived a young Methodist divine who hastily assumed that Luke taught the natural-paternal birth.[22]) See, for instance, Luke ii. 33, 41, 43, 48, iii. 23, iv. 22; John i. 45, vi. 42. This mode of speaking is

[20]Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament," i. 567, quoted by Sweet, 119.

[21]W. C. Allen, Commentary on Matthew, chapter I., in "International Critical Commentary."

[22]*Methodist Review*, N. Y., January, 1923, 117.

due to two facts: (1) The manner of the birth was not a thing to be proclaimed from the housetops. It was as fitting as it was psychologically inevitable—the parents being such as they were—that this holy and divine secret should live in their hearts alone, and should come out only at the fitting time and place. (2) Joseph assumed his place as the legal father of the Child, socially and technically guaranteeing his legitimacy, and therefore "went" everywhere as his father. Even if the public had known the facts, the Semitic mind would have considered this foster parentage as perfectly natural. Speaking of early Arabia, W. Robertson Smith says: "A man is father of all the children of the woman by whom he has purchased the right to her offspring, that shall be reckoned to be his own kin. . . . Ultimately if a child was born in the tribe of a woman brought in by contract of marriage, it was reckoned to be of the tribal stock as a matter of course without inquiry as to its natural procreator."[23] Mrs. A. S. Lewis well says that unless Jesus had passed as the son of Joseph, the latter could not gratify his wish not to expose Mary (Matt. i. 19), and the Jews could not have said, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" (Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3). Mrs. Lewis further says that in her Syriac manuscript (fifth or sixth century) "*Protevangelium Jacobi*," written for the express purpose of glorifying the perpetual virginity of Mary, the angel says to Joseph, "She shall bear *to thee* a son," which shows again that language which to a Westerner would imply physical paternity did not necessarily to a Semite.[24] In any case the passages which mention "Joseph's son" are amply covered by the father's legal position, and do not invalidate the Birth.

---

[23]W. R. Smith, "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia," 1885 (2d edition, 1907), 109, 120.

[24]Mrs. Lewis, in *Expository Times*, November, 1900.

10. Mary's Alleged Later Hesitation as to Christ.

It is said that if Mary knew that her Son was supernaturally conceived she would not have betrayed doubt in regard to his ministry, or anything but enthusiastic loyalty. It is worth while to look into these passages. There is an account of a tremendous crowd which pressed into the house (perhaps where his mother lived), even interfering with meals. "His friends"—not necessarily his mother—heard of this, and "went out to lay hold on him" on the ground that "he was beside himself" (Mark iii. 20, 21). We do not know who these friends were. Later his "mother and his brothers," from the outside of some house where he was teaching, called him. The folks inside told him of this. Then he gave that famous answer about those who do the will of God being his brother and sister and mother (iii. 31-35), or "those that hear the word of God and do it" (Luke viii. 19-21). There is not the slightest evidence that Mary ever lost her faith in her Son or shared the skepticism of his brothers, so far as they had any.[25] On the other hand, it is not necessary to suppose that she should keep the rapturous expectancy of an earlier time, or that the long humdrum of thirty weary years should not have checked her youthful spiritual exuberance, or that at any time she attained to a perfect knowledge of who her Son was. "It is psychologically more probable and historically more certain that she developed very gradually a right understanding and appreciation of the character and nature of her Divine Son. If we suppose her at or after his Birth to have spoken of its circumstances to any of her most intimate friends, we may be sure the result would be to close her lips and hush her into silence. As the years passed by doubt and questioning, wonder and

---

[25]See Vassall-Phillips, "Conybeare on Mark iii. 21," London: Simpkin, 1910.

surmise, must have mingled themselves in her mind."[26] Was she entirely free from contemporary views of Messiah, and would not her son's words and works be sometimes perplexing to her also? And when Lobstein says that anything like this is "absolutely inconceivable" on the supposition of the Birth, he shows that he poorly understands human nature. But the wonderings of her devout soul, her nervous anxiety for the safety of Jesus, her reaction to the influence of his brothers—we cannot say that this argued unbelief of his Messiahship and divinity, so far as she understood them, not to speak of his Birth.

11. The Witness of John.

How can one witness to what he does not mention? John's Gospel came out between (say) 85 and 95 and his purpose was to prove (1) his Lord's true humanity over against Cerinthus, (2) his real incarnation over against the same and the Gnostics, (3) his Messiahship over against the Jews, and (4) his Divinity and his being the alone Saviour and Lord of life over against opposers both Jews and Pagans. He presupposes a knowledge of the three Gospels, and therefore does not repeat their accounts. For this reason, and probably for this reason alone, he does not mention the Birth. But he takes it for granted, and his whole thought moves in a circle wherein a non-miraculous birth is impossible. The preëxistence of the Word in and with God was axiomatic with John; and that Word "became flesh" (i. 14), which is absurd if Jesus was born of an earthly father. In fact, so implicit was the belief of a heavenly origin of their Saviour on the part of Christians in the last section of the first century, so widely was it taken for granted, partly because of their reading of Matthew and Luke, partly because it was involved both logically and religiously in their general

[26] *Church Quarterly Review*, London, July, 1904, 391, 392.

thought of him, that John did not think it worth while to refute the Jew-Gnostic Cerinthus on this one matter. Cerinthus knew and John knew that he stood refuted as to Birth by the whole drift of the Gospel. Besides, every other man has to be born from above, through water and the Spirit. Otherwise he "cannot see the kingdom of God." But John's whole argument excludes Jesus, who is, then, not "born of the flesh" (though he "became flesh") as all other men are. The trend of John's Gospel witnesses to the Birth as truly as though he had literally gone into it after the fashion of his predecessors Matthew and Luke.[27]

12. The Alleged Silence of Paul.

Before I take up Paul I might say that the silence of Mark is easily explained. He wrote for Romans, who were men of deeds and wanted a short account of Christ's life as a doer, the actual things he did and said which showed that the Christian claim that he should be loved, followed, and worshiped is substantiated. "There is no room for anything so irrelevant to the main purpose of his (Mark's) scheme as a description of Christ's childhood or of the nature of his birth. So the silence which was still being maintained at the time he wrote was respected by our earliest evangelist and left to be broken in due course by other writers."[28] He does not even mention Joseph at all. Mark wrote at the prompting—perhaps dictation—of Peter, and the latter's speeches in Acts are in the same key as the Gospel—namely, of him who went about doing good, through whose Name those who believe on him should receive remission of sins, the Good News of salvation, the actual evidence of deeds of saving virtue for the bodies, minds, and souls of men. "The Virgin

[27]Orr has excellent remarks here, "The Virgin Birth of Christ," 108-113.

[28]Prestige, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord," 67.

Birth was not the first subject upon which a missioner would pitch to speak of in the first century any more than in the twentieth; yet Mark's word would seem to have lain in giving the substance of the earliest mission preaching. Once again then it should occasion no more surprise that St. Mark is silent about the Virgin Birth than that St. Luke, who indisputably believed it, does not refer to it from the beginning of chapter iv. in his Gospel to the end of Acts."[29]

Paul's silence is brought forward by those who oppose the Birth. Here again we have to remember his purpose. He was preaching first to Jews, then to pagans, and in neither case had he the slightest occasion to refer to it. In fact, to have done so would have shown a colossal lack of good taste and good sense, and Paul was preëminent in possessing both. When it was published, the Jews made malicious use of it, and the heathen did not need it to receive Christ, and when once they did receive him they would take it—when taught—as a matter of course. Then, why did Paul write his epistles? To meet some local exigency, doctrinal, ethical, practical, administrative, etc. Was there need anywhere in the Roman Empire where his letters went for a statement of the Birth, much more for an exposition and defense of it? Absolutely none. Did the Jewish Christians deny it? No. Did the Gentile Christians? No. But did not Paul defend the Divinity of Christ, and might he not therefore bring the Birth in? Well, I should hardly say "defend," for it was not denied by any of his opponents except the regular Jews, and he wrote no epistle for them. All sections of the Church took the Divinity of Christ for granted, for it was only much later that the Ebionites or a section of them denied it.[30] And accordingly Paul never sets out

[29]Prestige, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord," 68.

[30]See Faulkner, "Modernism and the Christian Faith," 1921 (2d edition, 1922), 92-94.

deliberately to expound and defend the deity of our Lord, as he does the doctrines of justification by faith, the inclusion of the Gentiles, the resurrection of the body, and matters on which there were notorious differences of view; but in the midst of arguments not specially in this field of Christ's Person he makes numerous statements which go to show that that deity was one of the rocks of his faith. It was only much later when philosophical and apologetic needs arose that the question of the nature of Christ's divinity came up, and even then by no party in the Church was his Birth questioned.

Of course we do not know whether Paul heard the Birth discussed in Christian circles. But it is a very risky inference from our ignorance of what Christians were talking about to say that Paul did not know of that Birth. Even von Harnack admits that his friend, physician, and traveling companion Luke did know of it, and at the time when they were together.[31] If so, Luke may have mentioned it to his friend. Then, Paul was inquisitive and a student, and I wish I might have overheard the questions he put to him, to Peter, and to others. His chief interest, however, as Gospel preacher was not the outward details of Christ's life, but his salvation for the world founded on his incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and present activity through the Spirit. Even so, a universal negative as to Paul's epistles and the Birth is also risky. I would lay no stress on the omission of the father's part in Galatians iv. 4, but the Birth is suggested by the last Adam, the life-giving spirit of 1 Corinthians xv. 45 and the statement of verse 47 that the first man is of the earth, the second man is of heaven; or, if not suggested, is in harmony with the Birth, and no other natural interpretation of the verses can be seen. The Second Man marks the same critical beginning in human development as the

[31]Harnack, "Date of Acts," 144, 155.

first man did—each a new beginning. In Paul's mind Christ is not the natural outcome of his nation and country, but he is the creative start of a new race, in whom the whole race is gathered up. This would seem to be meaningless if Christ was not as divine in his origin as the first Adam was in Paul's mind, or—should we say?—infinitely more so. Besides, Paul traced universal sinfulness to our common possession of a human nature from Adam. But he held Christ as sinless. How could he do this without thinking of him as different from the rest of us in paternity or origin?[32]

But not only the doctrines of regeneration, sinlessness, and the Second Adam, but other ideas fit into the Birth. "This is my Body that is broken for you. This is my Blood of the new covenant. Take, eat, drink." While Christ's body was entirely natural as a human body, there is a premonition in the Lord's Supper of a spiritual effectiveness of that body, of its religious worth for redemption, of its being the agency through faith in the Lord who bore it and our sins with it upon the Tree, which harmonizes with the thought of the more than human origin of that body offered to us by the Birth. While perfectly natural, was not his body also "unique, a new thing, mysterious, primitive, the well-head of a river of new life"?[33] Of course our Greek, Roman, and Anglican friends would carry this much farther, but independent of that we can all feel that the significance of Christ's body in Christianity—atonement, eucharist, resurrection, eternal life—fits in with the Birth: divine origin from the Spirit, human origin from the mother.

---

[32]See Ince, "The Miraculous Conception of Christ," in *Expositor*, 5th series, volume I., 407, 408 (1895).

[33]G. A. Chadwick, "The Virgin Birth," in the same, January, 1905, 57.

13. The Apostles' Creed.

The Old Roman or the so-called Apostles' Creed which according to Kunze can be traced back in its essential elements to about 100,[34] and which in a fairly complete form goes back according to Harnack to about 140, Zahn 120, and Kattenbusch 100, has in its earliest forms the begetting by the Spirit and the Virgin Mary. I do not emphasize this, but it is a testimony to the primitive consciousness of Christians that the Birth was as truly a part of it as the crucifixion under Pilate, the forgiveness of sins, etc. The Apostles' Creed arose either as a handy statement of universally held Christian facts to be used in baptism, as is probable, or as such a statement to be used against Gnostic heretics, and in any case represents the belief of Christianity as such, not of any special division of it. The Creed, says von Harnack, "arose out of the missionary and catechetical function of the Church, and was originally simply a baptism symbol."[35] Besides, we have the direct testimony of Irenæus (about 175) that the Birth was universally held throughout the Empire.[36]

14. Second-Century Witnesses.

We must not suppose that second-century Christian witnesses simply reëchoed what they found in the rolls of what we call the New Testament. There is a difference in tone, atmosphere, trend, sometimes in direct teaching. We do not know how widely those rolls were copied, circulated, read. Historians have remarked on the legal-moral line taken by post-apostolic men, and of how few appropriated the daring evangelicalism of Paul.[37] These

[34]Faulkner, "The Origin of the Apostles' Creed," in *Biblical Review*, N. Y., January, 1920, 103-116 and the references there given.

[35]"*Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss*," 1892, 18.

[36]Irenæus, "*Contra Haer.*," I. x. 1 (read whole chapter).

[37]See Faulkner, "Crises in the Early Church," 1912, 146-149.

men were not slavishly dependent on the New Testament; but whether they were or not, they were at one with it as to the Birth. Let us take them in order of time.

(a) Ignatius was bishop of Antioch in Syria, and in his journey to Rome, A.D. 110-117, wrote seven letters to Asia Minor Churches.

Hidden from the prince of this world (or age, αἰῶνος) were the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing, likewise also the death of the Lord—three mysteries of open proclamation, such as were wrought in the silence of God.[38] . . . I give glory to Jesus Christ, the God who bestowed such wisdom upon you; for I have perceived that ye are established in faith immovable, . . . firmly persuaded as to our Lord being truly of the race of David according to flesh, Son of God according to will and power of God, truly born from virgin, baptized by John, nailed up,[39] etc. (In Trallians 9 he speaks of Jesus as of the "race of David, son of Mary, truly born," a use of words which seems to hint at the Birth.)

Ignatius was writing against the Docetists (δοκέω, to appear), who said that Christ's flesh was in appearance only, and it would have been sufficient to refer to the reality of the birth, but he brings in also its supernatural character, as though that fact was taken for granted everywhere.

(b) Aristides of Athens wrote his "Apology" about 125 or 130. He says: "Christians trace their descent from the Lord Jesus Christ; now he is confessed by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, having come down from heaven for the salvation of men, and having been born of a holy virgin. . . . He took flesh, appeared to men."[40]

(c) Justin Martyr, who lived in Palestine, Asia Minor, and Rome, a philosopher and a well-informed Christian, wrote about 140-160, takes the Birth from a virgin for granted, on a level with the other facts confessed by all Christians about Christ. For instance: "He was born as

[38]Ignatius, "*Ad. Eph.*," 19. [39]"*Ad. Smyrn.*," 1. [40]"Apology," 15.

a man of a Virgin, and was called Jesus, and was crucified and died, and rose again, and has gone up into heaven."[41]

(d) Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, lived in Rome, and died as bishop in Gaul, was of wide acquaintance, and was thoroughly saturated with what we might call normal Christianity. His witness is important. He wrote about 175-190.

The Church, though scattered over the whole world to the ends of the earth, yet having received from the apostles and their disciples the faith [perhaps the following is a formal confession or chant of faith]

In one God the Father Almighty . . . and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation, and in the Holy Spirit, who through the prophets proclaimed the dispensations and the comings, and the birth from virgin, and the suffering, and the resurrection from dead, and the bodily assumption into the heavens of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, and the coming (παρουσίαν) from the heavens in the glory of the Father.

Having received, as we said, this proclamation (or preaching) and this faith, the Church, though scattered over the whole world, guards it diligently, as inhabiting one house, and believes in accordance with these words as having one soul and the same heart; and with one voice preaches and teaches and hands on these things, as if possessing one mouth. For the languages of the world are unlike, but the force of the tradition (παραδόσεως) is one and the same.[42]

(e) Tertullian was a vigorous, widely read lawyer-presbyter of Carthage, who, though an intense Christian, was an independent thinker. He wrote 197-215.

The Word by whom all things were made was sent by the Father into a Virgin, was born of her, God and man, Son of man, Son of God, and was called Jesus Christ.[43] He says the same in two other places.[44] He places the Birth among the indisputable facts of what he calls the "Rule of Faith, which is altogether one, firm and unalterable."

---

[41] "1 Apology," 46. See also 31, and "*Dial. c. Tryph.*," 85.

[42] "*Contra Haerer.*," I. x. 1, 2. A like witness in III. iv. 1, 2.

[43] "*Adv. Praxeam.*," 2 (about year 208-209, Bonwetsch).

[44] "*De Praes. Haer.*," 133 (199).

(f) Clement, the philosophical, cultured dilettante of Alexandria, writing about 190-215, looks upon the Birth as on a level with the ordinary universally received facts of Christianity.[45]

It is not necessary to continue these quotations further. They do not prove the Birth true. They only prove that every Christian of the second century who knew enough to write a book and had any occasion to refer to it took it to be true. Not that every Christian had such occasion. Hoben makes it a point against the Birth that so few do refer to it—"that uniform and notable silence" on the birth and early days of Jesus.[46] But the Apostolic Fathers and their successors wrote from impulses which had nothing whatever to do with the outstanding facts of Christ's life, not to speak of the manner of his birth. Therefore for those facts we are shut up almost entirely to the Gospels. The miracle is that we have as many references to the Birth as we have. Suppose there was something remarkable in the circumstances of your birth. How often would you or your friends have occasion to mention it even in conversation? Seldom. In published writings? Never. The cases in which Hoben thinks the Birth might have been brought in do not bear out his point. The fact is that whenever it came within the deliberate scope of the writer to speak of the Birth, whenever there was a fitting or inevitable call for it, he bears witness to it. That is all we can expect, almost more than we might hope for. The parable of the Prodigal Son has only a solitary witness. But it is enough.

15. Deniers.

Were there deniers of the Birth? Yes. When? In the second and third centuries. Who were they? (1) Gnostics.

[45]Clement of Alexandria, "*Stromata*," vi. 15 (A. N. F. ii. 509, col. 2).

[46]"The Virgin Birth," 1903, 17.

(2) Jews and Pagans. (3) A section of the Ebionites. It is not necessary to linger over the second class. They invented horrible stories of Mary's adultery, a Roman soldier, and all that. No Jew or Pagan believes them now and in a brief sketch like this we must dismiss them. What about the Gnostics? They were a multi-colored sect (or sects) of the second century and later, having their roots in the first century, who held that the body or matter was opprobrious, with which the highest God could have nothing to do, and that only the lesser gods or emanations or æons could mix with it in proportion to their distance from God.[47] One of these Gnostics was Carpocrates in the second century, who claimed that the world was created not by God but by angels, that Jesus was a mere man, born of course naturally, on whom the power of God came down, and that he could thus be classed with Pythagoras and Plato. Cerinthus was another Gnostic of the second century who denied the Birth. He held that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph and Mary, upon whom, at or after his baptism, the Christ came down to enable him to proclaim the unknown Father and do miracles, and that this Christ left him before his final sufferings.

What was the interest behind the speculations of Gnosticism? It was exactly the same as the modern "liberal" or rationalist, though for another purpose—to disconnect "Jesus" from "Christ." The more the Gnostic was Christian, or the more he shared the view of the Church as to Christ's divinity, the more he was concerned to separate Christ from matter; and as he knew that Christ really appeared under two aspects he divided these two by claiming that it was the man Jesus who had the body and the sufferings, and that the divine Christ was a heavenly æon who came down upon Jesus, dwelt in

[47]For brief but comprehensive statement on Gnostics see "The Gnostic Crisis," in Faulkner, "Crises in the Early Church," 34 ff.

him as a sort of foreign yet inspiring body, and left him before the final tragedy. I do not find that the Gnostics alleged in support of their views any historical tradition contrary to that in the Church. Their objections were philosophical or theological purely. Perhaps it was because the influence of history was too strong for the Ophite branch of the Gnostics to resist that they accepted the Birth.[48]

We come now to the third class of deniers. The Ebionites were a section of the more reactionary Jewish Christians of the second century who denied the Birth. Some ancient authorities use the word roughly of all of this sect, and others distinguish between those of them who affirmed and those who denied. A thoroughly wide-awake and intelligent Christian observer, Justin Martyr, who wrote about 140-150, tells us about different kinds of Jewish Christians. He says there are those who believe in Christ and keep the institutions of Moses for themselves, yet do not force these upon other Christians; and there are those who are both believers and Jews, but would compel all Christians to be also Jews as to Moses's laws. With this second class Justin will have nothing to do.[49] Justin then goes on to speak of the ordinary Christian view as to the Messiahship, preëxistence, and Birth of Christ, but adds: "There are some of your [he is speaking to Trypho the Jew: the reading is not *our*, but *your*, as has been discovered in the primary Greek manuscript in the National Library, Paris] own race who confess that he is Christ, but maintain that he was born a man from men; with whom I do not agree, nor would the majority of those who have come to the same way of thinking as I, since we have been commanded by Christ himself to obey not human teachings but the things that were proclaimed

[48]See the admirable discussion by Machen, "The Virgin Birth in the Second Century," in *Princeton Theological Review*, 1912, 542 ff.

[49]Justin Martyr, "*Dial. c. Tryph.*," 47.

through the blessed prophets and taught through him."[50] There was a section among the extreme left of the Jewish Christians, therefore, who in the interest of a non-divine Messiah denied the Birth, though Justin himself received it as fundamental, apparently as much so as the Incarnation itself.[51] But that emergence of naturalism is a little eddy on a far nook on the left shore of the wide stream of Christianity, and represented the latter as little as the No Button Mennonites represent the historic river of Protestantism.

16. Alleged Pagan Parallels.

Critics who deny the Birth differ as to the origin of the belief in Christianity. Some claim a Jewish origin. So Lobstein. We have already seen that there was no psychological nor historical preparation in Judaism for such a belief, that Isaiah vii. 14 did not necessarily teach it, and that Matthew's reference to that passage is in keeping with his whole bearing to the Old Testament, always religiously, not always scientifically, exact. Cheyne suggests a Babylonian origin. But how could Babylonian myths get into the heads of early Christians? Some have referred to the Buddha legend. This Indian sage belonged to the fifth century B.C., and about 400 years later there came out in India a worthless story to the effect that his mother, who was married, was sleeping surrounded by her women. She dreams that a white elephant enters her side. This is the conception of her son the Buddha.[52] But no one has explained how such a fable came into the possession of Christian circles in the primitive Church, nor how if it did it could give rise to the beautiful and almost splendid narratives of our Gospels. Besides, the

---

[50] *Ibid.*, Justin Martyr, "*Dial. c. Tryph.*," 48.

[51] *Ibid.*, 84. In 85 he includes the Birth in a form of exorcism.

[52] See Sweet, "Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ," 1906, 162, with his references.

Buddha's mother had been living with her husband, and though the legend claims chastity it does not claim virginity. Then, there are no signs of later growth or accretions to our Birth story. They give the impression of naked simplicity. "The Infancy narratives stand among the most primitive portions of the New Testament, and exhibit fewer touches of the later ideas of the disciples than almost any others."[53] Thus their connection with the Buddha or other legends is unbelievable.

There are also the Greek and Roman stories of divine births. Rationalistic critics like Holtzmann, Schmiedel, and Usener look to these—"these heathen representations," says the first, "transferred to the world-conquering Son of God in the East." It is credulity gone mad. Notice: (1) The Greek myths have no historical basis, connection, atmosphere. The New Testament Birth is in a setting of details of time, place, relation, etc. (2) The former have no worthy religious bearing; the latter is a part of a divine history of salvation. (3) The former are accounts of actual sexual relations of lustful gods transformed into men (or more ignoble transformations) for the purpose. The heathen writers of the second and third centuries made the same use of these myths to discredit the Birth, but Origen was so impressed with its horrible unfairness that he thought such use an evidence of buffoonery, not of serious thinking.[54]

More fitting is the reference to the birth-myths of Plato, Alexander, and Augustus. The idea is that the sacred writers, like the scholars of Pythagoras or Plato, wanted to enhance the divine genius of their Master by alleging a divine origin. But, as Nösgen says, critics ignore the fact that these heathen apotheoses, such as Speusippus's mention of Apollo's relation to Periktione,

[53]Sweet, 162, note. See Faulkner on Buddhism in *Methodist Review*, N. Y., May, 1915, 455 ff.

[54]"*Contra Celsum*," i. 37.

the wife of Ariston (by whose wife, the myth said, the god begat Plato), proved how impossible it was to keep from distorting the nature of their gods into the picture of sensual humanness. And he adds that it is equally forgotten that with Jesus it has to do not with a philosophical genius, but with One who knew himself so certainly as Son of God that he would rather take the shame of the cross than deny Himself, and that his followers therefore were under no occasion to invent the story that he came down out of heaven to become the Son of Man (John iii. 13).[55] Besides, the fathers and mothers of great men like Plato were perfectly well known, and ascribing to them a divine parentage was only an "official" or polite flattery which deceived nobody. Further, in no case were the mothers virgins, or claimed to be. Augustus did everything in his power to promote the belief that Apollo was his father. "Observe the contrast between these fables unblushingly spread abroad by the persons immediately concerned and by interested flatterers and the stories in the Gospels. Where are the priests here to invent the story?"[56]

What you can say is this: There was a disposition in paganism to invent stories of divine births for their heroes and gods, and that disposition witnesses to the true instinct of humanity to connect its highest gifts with the Higher Powers. Yes; but the Birth in the Gospels is at a vast remove from these stories, and stands in its own ample rights as historically, æsthetically, and religiously grounded, and as harmonizing—and it is the only explanation of the origin of Jesus that does—with the whole record of which it forms a part.

---

[55]Nösgen, "*Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*," in "*Allgem. Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*," 1902, col. 1252.

[56]Orr, "The Virgin Birth of Christ," 171.

17. The Real Question.

I have come to the limits of space set for this discussion. Those who believe in that minimum of historical Christianity—say as embodied in the Apostles' Creed—confessed from the beginning till now by the whole Church of Christ will have little patience, perhaps, with this essay. They will say: Having accepted the Christianity of the New Testament, why are you concerned over one part of it? But here's the rub. The parts cohere. And the Birth is either denied or waved aside by thousands to-day who in the wake of German rationalism and rationalistic reconstruction of Christianity are out of sympathy with that supernaturalism which is the cohering element, that bond, crown, glory of our religion—the essential thing which makes it differ from all other religions: Jesus Christ Son of Man, Son of the Father, eternal Lord and Saviour. But some who shrink from going too far say, But we can have him by natural birth. Yes, you can have a religious genius, a saint, a lofty prophet of the Galilean hills. But if he preëxisted with the Father, as he claimed, if on account of that preëxistence he alone knew the Father, as he claimed, there was only one way in the nature of the case in which he could come in the flesh, and that is the way in which history says that he did come.[57] Deny that, and you are bound in time to work around to this conclusion: He was not divine in essence, except as we all are; and, The historical records are worthless, for if they are false as to his origin who can trust them as to other crucial matters? And that leads to the Real Question, the first and last question in Christianity: Who is Jesus Christ?

[57]See further Faulkner, "The So-Called Virgin Birth," in "Modernism and the Christian Faith" (2d edition,1922), 300 ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BOOKS: Hoben, "The Virgin Birth," University of Chicago Press, 1903. Randolph, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord," Longmans, 1903. Lobstein, "The Virgin Birth," Williams and Norgate, 1903 (indirectly). Sweet (L. M.), "The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ," Westminster Press, 1906. Orr, "The Virgin Birth of Christ," Scribners, 1907. Thorburn (T. J.), "Critical Examination of the Evidences for the Doctrine of the Virgin Birth," Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1908. Skrine, "Miracle and History: A Study of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection," Longmans, 1912 (48 pages). Prestige, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord," Scott (London), 1918. Taylor (Vincent), "Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth," Oxford, 1920.

Articles: Cooke, *Methodist Review*, November, 1904. Farrar, *Expositor*, January, 1895 (Syriac Gospels). Ince, same, June, 1895. Garvie, same, February, 1902. White (N. J. D.), same, March, 1903. Chadwick (G. A.), same, January, 1905. Sanday, *Expository Times*, April, 1903. *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1904 (Criticism of Gospels), and October, 1904. Machen, *Princeton Theological Review*, January and April, 1912 (Hymns of First Chapter of Luke; Origin of First Two Chapters of Luke), and October, 1912 (Virgin Birth in Second Century). Ramsay (H. M.), *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1916 (on Early History). Zerbe, *Reformed Church Review*, January, April, July, 1922.

Articles in books: Gore, in "Dissertations on the Incarnation," Scribners, 1895, pp. 1-70. Gruetzmacher, in series of essays on Apostles' Creed by different authors, translation by Hay, "The Truth of the Apostles' Creed," Lutheran Publication Society (1916, pp. 70-85). Nösgen, "*Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi*," in "*Allg. Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*," 1902, cols. 1145 ff., 1168 ff., 1193 ff., 1227 ff., 1250 ff.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 11

The Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ

By THE EDITOR

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1924

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 10.—"The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord," by John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 11.—"The Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ," by the Editor.

Number 12.—"The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ," by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER ELEVEN.

The Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ.

By the Editor.

(475)

[illegible]
[illegible]HOOL OF THEOLOGY

XI.

THE BLOOD ATONEMENT OF JESUS CHRIST.

The active, and more or less organized, movement, even in some sections of the evangelical Church, against the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, and the skeptical attitude assumed toward the Resurrection, have left the tremendous doctrinal integrant of the Atonement in a somewhat isolated situation. The alignment against the Birth and the pseudo-scientific rejection of the Rising have found no satisfactory weapons against the sacrificial offering made by Christ on the cross. The result is that the Scriptural testimony to the Atonement has been more frequently passed by than assailed. The world, even in its higher intellectual emprise, is, alas, not seized of the sense which leads to an inquiry concerning this testimony. Objection is, nevertheless, radical and evident. This objection to the blood Atonement comes logically with the movement against its two divine cognates, the Birth and the Rising.

Great spiritual zest, and no small intellectual stimulus, are given the defense of these fundamental facts of Scriptural history in the reflection that, shortly, the force of the whole critical and controversial contest is to be centered on the Christology of the New Testament. That is to say, the all in all of religious thought and controversy is to be Christ, his personality and teachings. It is a subject which world thought, however inept and antagonistic, cannot disregard. If not from decimation and defeat, then from sheer weariness and exhaustion, radical criticism of the Old Testament is to lose its long-maintained militancy and drop out of the trend. But He who was set for the "casting down imaginations, and every high thing," must remain the center of the world's faith and life, still

betrayed and rejected, but still worshiped, until every thought be brought into the captivity of obedience. Old Testament criticism has pertinency only because of its relation to Him. The before-sighted doctrinal contest of the future is prophetic assurance of the vitality of the evangel.

It goes without saying that interpretational theology is more profitable than controversial; but the need of the times is for both, and most certainly interpretational theology cannot to-day make itself wholly intelligible or effective without attention to categorical objections. A happier time may come, when spiritual teaching will be without division: it was not so in the time of the making of the New Testament canon, nor has it been since. The fortunes of the divinest of the Christian doctrines testify to this end. The assaults of destructive criticism on the historical and compositional claims of the New Testament having ended in complete victory for the Christian Scriptures, a subtending and surviving pragmatism now attacks those doctrines of the gospel without which it must fail of relevancy and force, the doctrines which expound the divine personality and redemptive work of Jesus the Christ —the Virgin Birth, the blood Atonement, and the bodily Resurrection.

It is partly through the influence of a recrudescent Arianism, but more particularly through a pride-fostered scientific confidence, that pragmatists have been able to form a camp and hold their ground. Theirs is a syncretism of the teaching of the Antichrist of ancient and modern schools. It is this that has brought into such extraordinary prominence in recent times the lines of organized opposition to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. Happy will it be for Christian thought and studenthood, if the composite character of the leadership which seeks control of their ranks be detected; if they come to know the critical refinements and truculent methods of those who seek to fix

the paternity of Jesus in the carpenter for what they are—the garbled confession of long anathematized heresiarchs and of the synagogue of the oldest of the unbelievers.

The second of these doctrines—the blood Atonement, concretely, the whole meaning and end of the Crucifixion—is to be the subject of a reverent meditation and study in this booklet. This doctrine is climacteric in the sense that it links the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection together, and becomes void if they, or either of them, be undermined or disproved. It is only in keeping with the facts of the record and the philosophy of the truth involved to say that the ideal of atonement has always sunk to the level of faith in the Birth and the bodily Resurrection. The phenomena of the Birth and the phenomena of the Rising not only find their full significance in the Atonement, but are identified with it: they are the Atonement in process and realization. The Sacrifice is coextensive with the Incarnation, even antedating its actuality in the record of the *Kenosis*. The Atonement not only reaches to and explains the Resurrection, but interfuses it with eternal purposefulness. Atonement can only be thought of in an all-comprehensive, eternal relation. It not only carries the essence of human redemption, but it secures the steadfastness and loyalty of the principalities and powers in the heavenly places. It is the media of the Messianic triumph. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?" And it is not easy to escape the impression that the first clause of this Scripture is causative in meaning, though the Greek text of each clause is clear enough, each having individuality, and the two being simply copulated. But that the Christ should suffer in order to enter into his glory is both a devout and justifiable interpretation. It is in harmony with the consistent testimony and argument of the New Testament Scriptures.

Leaving aside, for the moment, the bald indifference

and purblindness of the rationalistic school, we make note of those theories that take only a partial or ineffective view of the truth of atonement—"broken lights," they are styled by Dr. Orr. This ordering will show the reader the logic of our choice of a line of argument in the following pages. First, may be mentioned as "infra-Scriptural" all theories of the death of the Son of Man which, though admitting the wondrous submission of his love and the affluence of spiritual results flowing from his obedience, yet holds his death to be without absolute moral necessity; a sublime and supreme sacrifice within the Galilean will and consciousness, but not a propulsive out of his vital headship of the race and the fullness of his Lordship of the universe. In the purview of this theory, the sacrifice was that of obedience to a necessary personal Galilean ideal, which, though tremendously productive in human motive and faith, was not an answer to divine justice, nor did it transcend the heroism of the highest thinkable devotion. Indeed, if it were a devotion before or since unmatched, it is to stand only as the token of the spiritual super-man, who is to come in the order of spiritual evolution. It is impossible to escape the conviction that this measures the Soteriology of not a few Christian pulpits, other than those of the Unitarian school.

Another set of theories "seek the sole explanation of atonement in the ethical motive; purely moral theories." (Hastings.) Propounders of such theories see only a one-sided reconciliation in the Atonement—the reconciliation of man to God. The Cross expresses only the divine willingness to receive men, and serves as a guidepost on the way to restoration. The Atonement represents the measure and response of the human powers. Save for uses of sympathy and inspiration, the divine content is not operative. It is the penalty of a sensibility dulled by the pride of intellect that it cannot read from the Scriptures the tremendous need of reconciliation on the

divine side, thus showing the Atonement to be a double accommodation. Nothing short of a propitiation of the divine justice can meet the spirit or letter of the Scripture record. The integrity of the divine law is restored in the sacrifice made by Jesus Christ, whose representative obedience is appropriated and shared in by those who rejoice in the Atonement.

A third theory of the Atonement assesses its merit in Christ's surrender of a holy will to God—in his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross. This obedience must be identified as belonging to the Atonement, but it is but a segment of its circle. The Scriptures "recognize the submission of Christ to the actual penal evil of sin—specially to death—as that rests in the judgment of God on our race." (Orr.) Obedience and propitiation unite.

Yet another variation of this theory puts the essence of atonement in the *penal endurance* of Christ on the cross, without reference to the response of his Soul to the divine will and love, and without reference to a dynamic of reaction on the consciousness of the race. This is nearly or quite identified with the rigid and mechanical substitutionary theory of early Calvinism, the mathematical election, "which can neither be increased nor diminished." Bald and fatalistic as this theory appears in its scholastic dress, it traverses, at least in part, the letter of truth; but it becomes, at last, so one-sided as to caricature the tragic divineness of Jehovah's justice. Christ did die for the world's sins, and, verily, in substitution for each and every man, whose life the divine law exacted; but he died not as a malefactor, nor yet as a martyr, *but as God.* In this truth, and in this alone, is the righteousness of the divine law balanced with the tragedy of the Crucifixion. In this light the Atonement becomes the supreme Theology.

It will be noted by the reader that, though this brochure seeks to cover the critical arguments against the New Testament teachings concerning vicarious suffering and

sacrifice, the method is more discussional than controversial. This is due to the fact that we have found the objection seeking to negative the New Testament doctrine of atonement by ignoring its challenges. These challenges are irrelevant to the thought plans of a school which has decreed that the whole output of revelation must be subjected to an arbitrary scientific appraisement. But the method we have adopted presents the parity and unity of gospel doctrine as the answer to what is both overt and latent in rationalistic interpretation. Atonement is the binding thought of all revelation; and when approach is made to its central ground about the Cross, the exhibit becomes so much of the fact itself as to need only the terms of its own record.

Such then being the scheme and reach of the Atonement, as read from its own record, to break one of the links in its chain is to render the whole concept ineffective, from both the intellectual and the spiritual viewpoints. The history of early Church heresies, which began under the very eyes of the apostles, abundantly expounds this. The condition under which truth must make its appeal to faith has not changed since the beginning. It is still demonstrable that a half truth is on the way to the house of complete error. Error in connection with the doctrine of the Atonement is the error of death. Let the record determine the correctness of this judgment.

1. What is the place and statement of the doctrine of the Atonement in the Scriptures? The actual question to be answered is this: Do the Scriptures teach atonement in a vicarious and substitutionary sacrifice? Is the truth of the gospel dependent on a sacrifice of this nature for its connections and effectiveness? The categorical demand is such that only a categorical answer will suffice. We are confident that this answer is forthcoming from the Scriptures. There are also strong collateral arguments lying in a realm in easy command of these oracles. St. Anselm,

in "*Cur Deus Homo?*" has marshaled these in a manner which, though tinged deeply with scholasticism, has yet held the esteem of Christian thought for near a thousand years.

As has already been observed, rationalistic criticism has perpetually failed to apprehend the most elemental truth of the gospel—namely, that it is a record of accomplished facts; a catena of related events, finished in time and history. To regard any part of the gospel otherwise than as an event, essential in that Life which was the incarnation of all verity, is to miss the one certain means of analyzing it to proof and understanding.

Life is always greater than the philosophy or science that expounds it. Validated history not only is a species of philosophy, but is the very highest exhibit of the philosophical element. It is, indeed, the acknowledged source of philosophy, and from its finality there is no appeal. Biography, the unit of history, is an assessment of actualities in individual living. The philosophy of it is in the motives and deeds of the life described. The reason is found in itself; each life is its own book. The gospel of Jesus Christ is the supreme Biography; its reason is in itself, and is abundantly and affirmatively exhibited in its various stages and manifestations. While it is consonant with human philosophy, it exhausts the categories and creates a philosophy of its own. The Blood Atonement is the most tremendously logical statement ever proposed to the universe of thought. Its cogency is the cogency of Fact.

The whole doctrine of atonement is sealed and validated in the supreme scriptural dictum, "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." But a direct development of the idea proceeds from symbol and animal sacrifice to the perfect Archetype. Throughout the course of this development the idea of substitution is prominently exhibited. Vicarious suffering comes forward with increasing clearness. The blood, as the seat of life, serves as

an element of substitution: "A life for a life." The sense of suffering, emotional, passional, personal, expounds the higher vicarious office. The distinction may seem technical; but substitution and satisfaction are scripturally declared to be contents of atonement. Without these the term is a gratuity.

The examples of patriarchal blood sacrifice, as those offered by Abel, Noah, Abraham, Job, Isaac, and Jacob, carry only a general suggestion of atonement, except perhaps in the case of Abraham's offering of a ram in lieu of Isaac, in which the divine Substitute is clearly prefigured. Job is represented as offering a sacrifice for his sons, lest they had "sinned and cursed God in their hearts." The idea of atonement is, however, to be clearly inferred. The absense of specific doctrinal suggestion from these examples of pre-Levitical sacrifice stands, according to our view, as an evidence of the correctness of the traditional claims for the authorship of the venerable writings that carry their record. They were acts of personal worship, coming prior to a priestly order, and unattended by ritual or exposition.

The Levitical ritual is introduced with the institute written at Exodus xxx. 10: "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of the altar once in a year with the blood of the sin offering of atonements: once in the year shall he make atonement upon it through your generations." The seasonal and frequent sacrifice of the tabernacle and temple altars is in line with this high priestly institute. At Leviticus xvii. 11 we read: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."

The spirit and letter of prophecy are well and effectively represented in the Christological climax of Isaiah: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him;

and with his stripes we are healed." Any attempt to emphasize the teaching of substitutionary sacrifice and vicarious suffering in this passage would be supererogation. He was bruised for "*our* iniquities"; the chastisement of "*our peace*" was "upon *him*." *Ancientism* stands tremendously against *modernism.*

The prefiguration of the sacrifices of the old Levitical law, with their implications of substitution and atonement, is fully attested and summed up by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" With this testimony agree St. Paul (if, indeed, he be not the author of Hebrews) and the other New Testament writers. At Romans iii. 25, 26, St. Paul epitomizes the history and doctrine of the truth of atonement in language which has become the finality of confession: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Here it is affirmed (a) that God has "set forth *a propitiation*"; (b) that this propitiation is "*for the remission of sins*"; (c) that this propitiation is to the end that God may be *just* in his own sight. In this passage redemption, reconciliation, and satisfaction are distinctly ascribed to the divine Judge. The soul that sins must die. The divine mandate must be satisfied: the Atonement is that satisfaction. Love and the reciprocity of agreement fill the eternity of redemption; but propitiation and atonement come in the crucial hour of forgiveness.

The vicarious sufferings of Christ are affirmed by St.

Peter in a passage that has stood without question, even in the fiercest issues of past controversy and criticism: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." St. John, in the Apocalypse, saw the hundred and forty and four thousand, in whose foreheads was written the Father's name. In the heraldry of heaven they are distinguished as those "bought from among men," the language reverting to the Sacrifice evaluated as a price in the eyes of Justice and Love.

A fruitful source of confusion in the theological thought of to-day is found in the conception of the Atonement as a separate dogmatic of the *ordo salutis*, a doctrine confined within terms and expressed in the use of particulars. This, in fact, is the discounting view held concerning the other two doctrines of this trilogy. The Virgin Birth thus, in the critical and modernistic mind, becomes a dogmatic and incidental aspect of the Christian statement; its acceptance or rejection does not affect the soundness of individual confession. The Resurrection is, in like manner, a detail of the esoteric judgment which lies well below the surface of operative faith. This situation, painful and distressing as it is, must be recognized as quite largely describing the theological attitude of the pulpits and schools of some sections of so-called evangelical Christianity to-day. The hope is an abiding one that this attitude will go the way of the critical contention of which it is the offspring.

The doctrine of the Atonement is indeed one of individuality, but that individuality is all-comprehensive, all-expositive. The Cross, the supreme instrumentality of redemption, has come to be regarded too wholly as a symbol of the literal sacrifice, and not as the means of the eternal revelation of God to the universe, to men and to angels alike. When the Cross stands as the symbol of a creed, or even as the conventional sign of universal faith,

it loses its place as the vocal of the supreme Personality, the passion which redeemed and recreated the universe, and the love and condescension which are the ideals, as they are the soul, of the divine administration. The Birth and the Resurrection, being cognates of the Atonement, cannot be expressed or held in terms that fall to a lower altitude of thought and faith than this. They are peaks of a common range, whose summits rise into mysteries far withdrawn from the sciences and processes of men. Their miraculous nature and eternal significance are their true identity, and must be accepted as the ground upon which they are to be dealt with, both in personal faith and in the interpretations of theology.

If "the history of the Church of God is, in its widest compass, coextensive with the history of the universe," as Gwatkin observes in his "History of the Early Church," it is a necessary verification to say that the Sacrifice is no less the substance than it is the cause of this history. The Crucifixion is the reddest rose of tragedy that ever blossomed upon the thorny stem of human history; and yet it passes out of the realm of tragedy and beyond the accident of human agency into the currents of the divine order, moving from eternity. Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The human participation has its place, in the order of its consciousness, with the immemorial sins of men. Sin is not made blacker by a special displeasure of God; moods and temperament are impossible to him. The actual murderers of the Son of Man were not more guilty than are the souls of those who "crucify him afresh and put him to shame" before the world. The judicial murderer, Pilate, and the truculent Sanhedrin are to be cited to a common tribunal with all who have sinned since the beginning. But the sacrificial suffering and the everlasting covenant of blood in the crucifixion stand in relation to the counsels of the Most High. The quality of suffering expressed in the spiritual

life of the universe is not only the measure of an office of healing to the uttermost, but is the interpretation of Godhood to itself.

The ancients taught us in the higher equations of mathematics to use the letter X as the sign of the unknown, the counter of numerals lying in mathemetical infinitude. The gospel teaches us that the Cross not only is the sign of the eternal verity, the counter of the totals of power which lie in the infinitude of redemption; but also that it is the fulcrum upon which the worlds beneath and above are to be lifted into an eternal "heading up" of all things in Christ. And let it be observed that the form of the word at Ephesains i. 10, *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*, is such as to indicate that the "heading up" is for God himself, thus bringing the Atonement to the fullness of its eternal design. All redemption is in and of the Godhood.

2. How is sin related to the Atonement as an eternal concept of God and as a realization in the administration of grace? It must be clear that any view of the Atonement which at all comports with the teaching of Scripture must go beyond a casual or locative relation to human sin. Sin is more than the letter or even the spirit of human transgression. It relates to a principle which but for repression, discipline, and, most of all, but for atonement, would operate with the range of the universe. It is only that sin is the sad and chief expositive of our mortal state that we have appropriated its meaning to ourselves. Sin has engaged the forethought of eternity. It is this fact that gives to the Scripture view of atonement its significance.

"Had there been no sin, would Christ have come and died?" That necessarily means, had there been no disobedience, would the eternal design of a sacrifice have been contravened? Was the fact of human disobedience, or the foreknowledge of it, of such radical force and such revolutionizing influence as to create a new necessity and bring

about a new order in the divine administration? The answer to this question hinges wholly on a definition of sin and its relations to the emotions of the divine soul and the movements of the divine will. The question concerning sin in world theology has almost uniformly proceeded inversely—*Whence* is sin, and not *what* is sin?

The question *whence* has always regarded sin as a thing in itself, and not as a condition, a state, resulting from the relation of other things. A familiar theory of sin in the theology of a modern school of holiness regards it as an entity, existing in original separation, transportable and transferable in element and dimension. But this is not an original vagary of present-day speculation; it is, in one form or another, as old as the distress of the human mind. Wizardry, witchcraft, and fetishism are figments of the belief that evil—the only form in which sin exists to the pagan mind—is a substance in itself and proceeds from without, and not from within the life. The old Nazaraic and Gnostic heresies, which sought the genesis of sin and finally located it in matter, as such, repeated the false psychology of previous ages and spawned a far-off folly which has, in modern days, erected itself into a science falsely so-called.

Sin is not a substance; it does not exist aside from the instant and sustained motive of an intelligent moral agent. It is the abortion, the violation, of principle, rather than being itself a categorical of thought. It is the infraction of law; the transgression of the commandment. It is treason against truth, after truth has been made manifest. It is that darkness that comes after the willful rejection of light; it is that disobedience which comes of the lack of a right will; it is that moral deformity which results from the rejection of right and purity.

Mental science has abundantly illuminated the ground of this reasoning; but the word of absolute authority comes in the statement of St. Paul: "I was alive without the law

once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." Sin cannot exist in God; sin cannot exist with God; so then in all his creation there was no sin. Matter, mind, and spirit, as definitives of his creation, are all good. And yet sin is an eternal possibility in the universe, in connection with the choice of moral free agents. The actuality of sin emerged with the first exercise of that choice by man. This possibility of sin, with its recurrent and continuous actuality, must remain in the universe until all moral choice is rendered steadfast through the law of spiritual recreation in divine grace.

The rationale of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is found in both the possibility and the actuality of sin. There are two sides of the movement of redemption—the side of its divine philosophy and the side of its cosmic history, the invisible stage and the visible stage. The historical side of redemption shows it in its world relation, with a world process and a world culmination. The side of the divine philosophy appertains to the consciousness and fullness of the Godhood apart, and is inclusive of the direction of the heavenly seats and dominions. Nothing transient, incidental, or expediential has marked the movement of redemption on either of its sides; its course has been from eternity; its forecasts and calculations concerning sin are not in any part or sense an afterthought.

Tremendous as were the details and conjunction of the history-stage of redemption, we are led to conclude that it was only the human culmination of the vast drama of self-revelatory sacrifice in God. The *pleroma*, which succeeded the ordeal of the Cross, is, so far as human thought may grasp it, no more real than was the *Kenosis* which drew its passion from a time before the foundation of the world. This is the argument for the unity of the redemptional scheme.

The universal moral need which lay within and beneath the sacrifice of Jesus Christ was for the introduction into

the consciousness of all moral being of the power to obey the divine will and realize the divine ideal of holiness. This could be done only through example and soul fellowship in obedience, supported by such tremendous overtures of sympathy and self-substitution as must needs come to the reddest letter of tragedy in the experience of the Exemplar. The logic of this tragic element was twofold—namely, to perfect the service of the Exemplar, and to compel, through unwonted intellection and emotion, the consciences of those for whom the example and substitution were undertaken. This became, in faith, not only the propulsive of exalted example in the pursuit of spiritual motive and ideal; but it became also the consciousness of a legal and gracious substitution for past offenses, without the removal of which a new hope is impossible. Herein is the spring of the new affection which makes the pursuit of the new ideal both effective and joyous.

Not to leave our terms in any sense involved, let it be said again that the Crucifixion was not an accident of history; not the chance outcome of the prejudice and hate of a Jewish sect; nor yet the carrying out of a divine decree which doomed particular men to its execution. It was, indeed, the immediate result of Jewish rancor; it was, indeed, the fulfillment of a divine prediction; but it came as naturally and as spontaneously as other deeds of violence and inhumanity have come. It was predicted to occur in the manner of its carrying out, because it was divinely foreknown that the logic of history and individual conscience would thus bring it to pass. It was the result of the working of human free will and choice.

Could it have been otherwise? The answer to that question is locked up with inscrutable omniscience; and yet redemption, with its vast implied theology, must needs have come through sacrifice and suffering. Aside from the history of sacrifice in the gospel, the philosophy of its necessity lies athwart the reaches of eternity. The history

is recognizable in the light of its philosophy. The eternal possibility of sin made eternal need of redemption. Suffering was thus elemental in redemption, since suffering is the propulsive of sympathy and substitutionary sacrifice; not the Cross only, but the Kenosis, the temptations, the life humiliations, the sorrow, and the soul agony, which to the Son was "even unto death." But the possibility of sin, which furnished the need for the sacrifice, also furnished the self-directed human will which accomplished its offering up, and left God forever justified in history and revelation.

3. What bearings on the scriptural view of the Atonement are seen in the cosmic or super-world effects of the sufferings and death of Christ? Not only was this thing "not done in a corner," as St. Paul said; it was not done exclusively in the whole world; it relates to all worlds. In its treatment of the Atonement, modernism has often substituted the entomology of a firefly for the cosmogony of the sun. The extension of the Atonement to thrones and powers in the heavenly places, and to the reconciliation of all things, calls for proof too high for the terms of a syllogism or the homologies of a self-indorsed science. We humbly trust to have led the student into the apprehension of this proof.

The death of Christ was, as we have seen, both expiatory and revelatory. It was to manifest and redeem humanity; it was also to manifest and justify God. The spiritual agonies of the Sacrifice were the pains of a divine parturition; the physical agonies endured on the cross were the immediate means of putting the double manifestation into fact. Had there been no hands wicked enough to crucify the Lord of Glory, his soul was still a sacrifice in the realm of the absolute revelation of God and humanity.

The revelation of God in humanity was self-imposed, and was of the nature of humiliation and suffering, though it involved absolute ideals of divinity, of the Godhead. One

of these was the destruction of sin through permanently establishing the divine life in human consciousness. The destruction of sin is the removal of the possibility of disobedience in moral beings. Sin exists nowhere except in moral consciousness.

Perhaps a further word of explanation should be entered here. The removal of the possibility of sin is conceived of in an ethical and temperamental sense; it is the corollary of a settled and empowered will. That which the scholastics call *peccability*—that is, liability of sin—remains always in finite moral creatures. It is not irreverence to say that the Galilean himself *could* have sinned; otherwise there had been no merit in his victory over the tempter; no merit in his example and sacrifice. His own explanation was that the tempter came and "found nothing" in him, no motive contrary to the divine will, though the human sense in him was strong even to the gates of death. The will and consciousness of the Galilean, as revealed in his temptations, expound the rationale of the Atonement in its effects on the multitudes of the redeemed. The "new man" is the new will, with its new motives and the restraints of the Galilean affections. The will is not destroyed, but reshaped to a higher incentive. The mathematical possibility of sin is not obliterated, but the moral possibility is contravened by coalescence with the Galilean Life and by the dynamic of the eternal Atonement. When probation ends in faithfulness, therewith comes an end of the moral stress and pressure of life. There is henceforth no more sin. As the Galilean is forever set down in his throne, so each victorious disciple is empowered to sit down in eternal spiritual security. Sin being thus forever negatived through moral victory, the range of the universe becomes free and secure. The "heading up" of all things is complete; there is a universal kingdom of Messiah.

Thus the Atonement sweeps into infinity with its *rationale* and proofs. Righteousness has been the watch-

word of the divine administration; but love has been its impelling force. The perfect reconciliation of these has been the divine policy. Only by atonement and adjustment, a satisfaction for sin, a moral propulsive coming out of suffering obedience and compassion, could this end be attained. It is attained in a cosmic, a universal, application. The principalities above are reconciled. The kingdom waits on men; first, to accept the testimony concerning the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and then through that propitiation to become fellow-citizens in the commonwealth above.

4. As we leave this contention for the verity of the blood Atonement, we are moved to ask, What inheritance has the body in this mighty scheme of atonement and redemption; and wherein does the inclusion of the body prove the substitutionary character of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ? We shall shortly be engaged in a contention for the truth of the doctrine of a bodily Resurrection. But from this present vantage the eternal future of the body borrows a tremendous significance. Shall the body be left behind? God forbid!

The doctrine of the body is involved in the Atonement. Theology has never fully expounded the involvement of the body in the rationale of redemption. St. Paul broadly and confidently affirms it; but the ages which followed his time have been too wholly influenced by mysticism or philosophy to push his tremendous initiative to a conclusion. The body had originally, and now forever has, through grace, an existence whose traditions and prophecies reach in every direction beyond the estate of its sins. The Atonement plays upon "the redemption of the body" of our humanity, which was the medium of the passing out and the return of Godhood to itself. The body of Jesus the Lord is the totality of the revelation in the "Word made flesh." The incarnation is integrant in the nature of the Godhood. Fatherhood is the primal identification of

God; but eternal Fatherhood necessitates eternal Sonship, and eternal Sonship finds its expositive for the whole universe, for angels no less than for men, in the Incarnation. In the Scriptures, and in the Christian consciousness, the Incarnation is as inseparable from that sacrifice in which we have located the rationale of redemption as the sun is inseparable from his own light. "His flesh" is not only the talisman of his days of suffering, but is the medium, the Urim, of all those wondrous revelations integrated in the story of salvation.

The office of blood in the Atonement appraises and seals the eternal relationship of the Galilean body of the Son of Man. "A body hast thou prepared for me." And yet that body necessitated eternal function and expounded eternal affection. Its identification was the blood which it gave to the sacrifice. Blood is the letter of life, the source and heredity of kinglihood. It is the steady current of manhood's being and virtues, or it is the constant riot of sin and disobedience. The blood of the Galilean was not only the last pledge in the Atonement, but it was the ultimate exhibit of the Life to the universe.

At the beginning of this section the question was asked as to what bearing the place given by the Scriptures to the body in the Atonement has upon the catholic doctrine of substitutionary sacrifice and vicarious suffering. It would appear that the matter has not been generally discussed from this viewpoint; yet the bearing must be direct and vital. We can give neither adhesion nor sympathy to the theory, having both an ancient and a modern statement, that the body—that is, the flesh—is the seat of evil and the sole occasion of human sinfulness. Without an attempt to set the matter forth in a scientific dress, we can only say that life must be considered as a unity. A dichotomous or a trichotomous terminology may serve a dialectical use, as the user is convinced; but when it comes to defining participation and amenability, the whole man—

spirit, soul, and body—must be involved in the *mea culpa*. The Scriptures themselves make this plain. The Master, in terms that leave no ground for misinterpretation, shows that both the souls and bodies of the wicked are to be cast into hell. In his multiplied references to the body, St. Paul advances the view that the body shares with the soul, or the spiritual man, the guilt of sin or the blessedness of redemption. Indeed, it is St. Paul who teaches, out of the fullness of his own experience, the necessity for the soul and body being in the accord of ethical obedience. He discovered an ethical warfare raging between his spirit and his body. His body he kept under through a discipline of buffeting, no less effective because moral, rather than physical; but to his spirit he administered a not different rote of correction.

It would be enough to argue from this Scripturally implied mutuality the claim of the body to an equal benefit with the soul in the Atonement; and to argue this claim as a proof of the substitutionary and vicarious ends of the Sacrifice. But a special proof emerges in a statement of Scripture which is consonant with the science of sensuous life—namely, that the appetency of the flesh, though not the sole occasion, is yet the most frequent occasion, of sin; still with the understanding that sin, of whatever nature or degree, becomes a consent and act of the mind. St. Paul, whom we have already quoted in this connection, says: "In me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing"; and this statement is not weakened when he continues to the admission that his mind (the unregenerate thought) consents to whatever the body desires or demands.

With this understanding of the unity of life in the Atonement, it comes to us as a logical conclusion that the place of the body in redemption not only calls for a juridical substitute and a vicarious expiation in the Atonement; but from the viewpoint of our purely human faculties it becomes the most ponderable proof of the same. Law, proph-

ecy, and gospel agree in this. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Beyond any question, these Scriptures are to be understood as denouncing spiritual death; but no less the suffering and death of the body. What then? The depravity and culpability represented in the body particularly suggest to the human thought the necessity for punishment and expiation. But the self-expiation of sin neither satisfies the righteousness of the law nor brings relief to the sinner. In death there is no remembrance of God; the sinner is dead. Therefore the Atonement, substitutionary and vicarious, provides that the law of justice may be satisfied, and that the sinner may live. It is a body for a body; a life for a life. "Who his own self bare our sins, in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness."

It is a point in eschatology which belongs to the discussion of the doctrine of the Resurrection, which is immediately to follow in this Series; but the bearing is so direct and important that we advert to the *Parousia* of the Risen Body in the Messianic kingdom, and to the prophetic inheritance in that kingdom of the bodies of all the redeemed. By every token of Scripture, it is the Galilean Body which is set down at the right hand of the majesty on high; in the bosom of that Body forever beats the Galilean Heart. The saints are with their Lord in celestial union and Galilean sympathy. But by what means? "To him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." "*That washed us in his own blood.*" Here is the expositive of the human side of the Atonement, nor less of the larger universal side. The washing of blood is first juridical, as applying to soul and body; then it is exemplary, dynamical, ethical. Once for all Christ died for the guilty and forever lives to draw all men into completion of soul and body for citizenship in the kingdom of his glory.

5. What are the present, and what are the assured future, attitudes of Christian thought toward the doctrine of the blood Atonement? Our own assessment of the discussional output up to the present, as already indicated, is that criticism of the Atonement is adumbrated by much indifference and dullness of spiritual perception. The sinister logic of consistency rules in the general cavil, both in pulpit and in school. The self-advised have listened to the propagandists of neo-Arianism against the Birth and the Rising, and must needs falter at the sight of the Sacrifice. The assault on the doctrines of the New Testament is not a divided fight; it relates to every part of the field, and when victory comes, as come it must, it will be all-inclusive.

What we apprehend the student will expect in this study leads us to remark upon the effects that must come to the evangelical Churches from the inroads of current dissent from the catholic view of the Atonement. That the present situation is serious, and that there is occasion for concern, goes without controversy. Where there is anything like alignment or complicity with this dissent, not only will the evangelistic spirit suffer, but the blight will extend to the general Christian consciousness and to the ethical output of Church testimony. The deepest springs of religion are those which exist in the emotions. This is the realm in which love is supreme. The relation holds after all necessary protection has been secured against fanaticism. A faith that is wholly intellectual is "barren and unfruitful." The emotional side of Christian experience comes of the passional revelations of the Atonement. "By his stripes we are healed." Through "the fellowship of his sufferings" comes "the power of his resurrection." "The Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." The moral and example theory of atonement can never repeat out of Christian consciousness the ground swell of passionate feelings and apprehensions which signify most in the

Pauline epistles. In the light of a purely intellectual interpretation, the sacrifice of Calvary is no longer the Archetype of the brazen serpent; but is rather made its replica in a newer age. Without the reënforcement of vicarious blood, the "new Commandment" is as impossible to men as was the old.

The richness, the power, and the effectiveness of the secular thought of Christendom relate to the pervasive emotional and intellectual vitality of the Christian doctrine of atonement. Both the just severity and the merciful clemency of the laws of Christian nations reflect the justice and the love which met in the vicarious sacrifice made for men on the Cross. The ultimate harmony attained in human song is represented by the note of suffering. The supreme heroism of action, the treasure trove of all literary quest, the finality of the philosophy of human motive, is the sacrifice and unselfishness of soul in its ministry to soul. These things find their full meaning in the fact of Calvary.

To deny the relevancy, the office, and the efficacy of the blood in the Atonement is to negative all revelation, orphan the affectional passion of life, and open the way for a creed as bald as atheism itself. Augustine, Anselm, and the post-Reformation creed makers overstrained their terms in giving to their interpretations of the Atonement an ultra-juridical aspect; but they were not astray in putting the satisfaction of the divine law and the adjuration of the divine mercy in the letter and spirit of the sacrifice of Christ. "Reconciliation" is as necessary a term in redemption as are "cleansing" and "forgiveness." A crimson theology is the only one which can ultimately prevail.

Let it then be written that the meaning and merit of redemption are in the suffering of the willing Servant of God; a suffering historic, prophetic, unannaled. The heraldry of this suffering—the *pathema*, the pathos of a

kingly soul in the passion of unimagined centuries—drew the Sacrifice onward ("from the foundation of the world") to a body prepared for him in the midst of the years. The instrument and the manner of the sacrifice found their place in time; but the *pathema*, the pathos of infinite love, the *pathology* of redemption, was of the Word which was in the beginning with God, and which was God.

With this eternal depth of meaning attaching to it, and with its assessed relation to the life of Godhood, to seek to explain the Atonement by means of a theory which applies it only as a moral and exemplary comment upon the sins of men is infinitely to belittle and dishonor it. If only the sins of men were involved, the violence of interpretation thus done might bring a less reproach. But as it relates to the whole moral administration of the universe, and goes with mysterious directness to the nature and necessity of the divine Will, it does not lie with men to give it another appraisement than that left to it in the Scriptures. It is a "Thus saith the Lord" concerning the atonement for sin and the moral vindication and upholding of the universe.

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

A SYMPOSIUM OF REVIEWS OF MODERN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND DOCTRINE

EDITED BY HORACE M. DU BOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Number 12

The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ

By
THE EDITOR

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
RICHMOND, VA.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1924

THE AFTERMATH SERIES

Number 10.—"The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord," by John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by the Editor.

Number 11.—"The Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ," by the Editor.

Number 12.—"The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ," by the Editor.

Note.—"The Aftermath Series" is designed to consist of twelve booklets to be issued in installments or sections. Several leading scholars in Europe and America have been secured to contribute to this series, and contributions from others have been solicited. The continuance of the series will depend upon the cordiality and extent of the support given it by the ministry and intelligent and loyal laymen of the Church.

PRICES

Per copy, postpaid	**$0.25**
Per dozen copies, postpaid	**2.50**

ORDER OF

Lamar & Barton, Nashville, Dallas, Richmond, San Francisco

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY LAMAR & BARTON

NUMBER TWELVE.

The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

By the Editor.

(501)

1422

XII.

THE BODILY RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

Considered from the viewpoint of human knowledge and experience, the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the climax of all miracles; and yet it is but one of a series or cluster of miracles which equally express Almightiness and equally expound the personality of the Son of God. It is only in this light that the doctrine of the Resurrection can find its proper setting and treatment. Approached and stated as an isolated fact, the Resurrection can only mystify and confuse the intellect. Taken in the sequence of those mighty signs of which, with the Ascension, it is the culmination, it brings the overmastering conviction that Christ must needs have risen in the manner in which the Evangelists record. The Resurrection was a continuous fact in the Galilean Life. It did not become overt or suddenly dynamic in the tomb of Joseph; but it there exhibited the natural and necessary omnipotence of the Messianic Personality. This Messianic Personality *is* the Resurrection, with all that is therein implied of divine self-affirmation and bodily rising.

In meeting the present-day skepticism concerning the Resurrection it is necessary to push the objection at once back to its logical inspiration and content. Whence is this skepticism? Why is this objection to the plainest terms of the gospel story of the rising of the Crucified? When answer is made to these questions, it will be found that the negation goes further back than even the objectors themselves profess to see. It reaches not only to a denial of the bodily rising, but it dissolves the fabric of the Life which brought the Body to a tragic death, complete resurgence from which was the only logical answer, and

which became a necessity in the face of the universe. In view of this alleged failure of the Life to fulfill itself, the gospel plan becomes inoperative; the challenge of divinity is weakened; and humanity, finding itself but half involved, loses both the impulse from, and the point of contact with, the larger life of the universe. In other words, the elimination of the human body from the resurrection has left faith in the future life without zest and proportion. It was interest in the human sense and thought that drew Godhood down, to enter into our flesh. It is this human interest, alive in Godhood, that draws the human sense and faith toward the skies. Faith is expectancy of the full realization in the heavenly state of this human sense, which answers to the human interest in Godhood. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is the pledge of this realization; but without the body the pledge is unfulfilled. The net result is an unrealized gospel, a wrecked redemption. This is the responsibility which the radical modernist must face.

Against this skeptical empiricism must be brought not only the charge of an open misappraisement of the body in the present and future experiences of redemption; but also of an open undervaluation of those things which are spiritual. It is a vain thought that by denying the body its place in the divine restitution to be wrought in the resurrection a higher estimate is put on the soul, with whatever else appertains to the spiritual self. Equal vanity is in the thought that the Higher Mind is honored by reason of a creed whose chief tenet contends for the freeing of the Author of Salvation from a task which is regarded as no more than a contract in ceramics. The Creator, who found his image in the body which he formed at the beginning, needs no self-appointed interveners to secure him against the obligation to deliver that body into final glory. Our theology has been remiss in not accepting the task of working out those fruitful leads of truth which relate our human state to the hidden life of Godhood. The eternal

Godhood cannot be separated in thought, as it cannot be separated in fact, from the Eternal Son. The Eternal Son is, to all the ranges and lengths of faith and thought, the Son of Man. Somewhere in this glorious maze of ideas the risen Body has its fitting relation. In that relation the risen bodies of all the redeemed shall share. It is to conduct such a process as will comport with these high thoughts that we are coming to the pending argument.

Although an anticipation of the more advanced stage of this argument, it is pertinent here to bring into view the general critical objection to the doctrine of the bodily resurrection of the Crucified—namely, that it was, and needs must be, only a spiritual rising; a restoration to personality of the spiritual and intellectual functions of the Galilean, who, succeeding to a spiritual dominion and priesthood, no more needed the clothing of his flesh. To this it is sufficient for the present to answer that, with the reality of the bodily rising and reanimation eliminated, resurrection is a misnomer as applied to the Galilean. There is no known or recognizable psychic principle which allows of the doctrine of a suspension of intellection or the higher spiritual functions in the dead. On the contrary, all the data of revelation, and no less of enlightened thinking, support the idea of the uninterrupted and continuous spiritual existence of the dead. The doctrine of soul-sleeping has never found hospitality in Christian thinking. If then the body is not to be restored, or if this restoration does not supply some essential and enduring need to the spirit, wherein is the significance of the word "resurrection" as applied to any stage or state of the dead? What kind of rising is that which the objectors to a bodily resurrection predicate of spiritual life which has never ceased to exist in consciousness and proper personality? These observations apply with absolute force to the Galilean Rising. The human soul or spirit of the Christ, equally with the Godhead of the Son, did not know death or suspension

of its powers. That is made plain in the Lord's own words to the dying thief, as also in the committal of his spirit to the Father as he expired on the cross.

The years of Galilean growth, answering the resurrection power of the Galilean Life, brought the Body to that maturity which was necessary to express through it the revelation and the sacrifice. There was never a moment from the Birth to the Crucifixion when this resurrection power did not live in and lie beyond the Body; never a time when the Body was not "a spiritual body" and capable of manifesting the completeness of divine resurgence. The Transfiguration, that so little understood phenomenon of the Life, is evidence of this, and became not only the earnest and prophecy of the bodily Rising, but concretely affirmed coexistence in the Galilean of the "Resurrection and the Life." But, as already observed, a more particular consideration of this view belongs to another section of this discussion.

Agreeing with the tactics and arguments of the critics against the record of the Virgin Birth and the blood Atonement are their methods of procedure against the record of the bodily Resurrection. This record, as it stands, is not denied by criticism. It is, in fact, allowed that there was a resurrection, and that this resurrection runs, in such measure as may be allowed under critical repression, to all the ends and uses attributed to it in the evangel. But the resurrection thus allowed was exclusively spiritual and impressional. True, there was the unexplained and inexplicable semblance of a risen body; but it was phantasmal, noncorporeal, and, in fact, non-existent. The contention is always for a "spiritual rising," with unclassified phenomena. The senses are asked to attest to an appearance which has no representation in any known category and which contradicts all the past impressional experiences of the race. No basis is left for the identification or classification of the Body as it was seen by the most intimate fol-

lowers of the Galilean. The phenomena of the post-resurrection manifestation, and the personal contact of the apostles and others of the disciples with the risen Body during the forty days, must be explained as mental illusion or phantasmagoria. This creates the most extraordinary situation in the history of human thought. It passes by every law known to psychic and physical science. Here is an appearance which fulfills the impressions produced by the sight of a living human body; it breathes, it speaks, it partakes of food, it moves and employs its members in the ordinary way; with its own proper voice, it declares itself to be possessed of flesh and bones, and invites test of the truth of this claim through physical touch and handling.

Besides there were expressed through this body, albeit in loftiest wise, the tokens of personal affection and fellowship. Memories of past association were recalled in the most intimate way, revealing a perfect restoration of the bodily and emotional functions. And yet all this is illusion! The body of the Crucified was not raised, but in the tomb disappeared through some ellipse of natural law, or through some mystery, which left no residuum behind, but which was accounted for in an apparition which baffles every faculty of the mind, as it contradicts every letter of Scripture and science.

Thus we see that the manner of criticism which denies the bodily Rising, and against which we are here contending, goes back to the situation created by the denial of the Virgin Birth. The Bethlehem birth, so the apology goes, was a fact and was made the central event of a divine program of extraordinary beginnings and extraordinary results; but the Bethlehem birth, notwithstanding the letter of the record, is not to be conceived of as miraculous. The Gospel story of the Birth is, therefore, to be passed by, discarded. What then? It clearly follows that those who affirmed the Virgin Birth and made its record in the Canonical Gospels were either grossly and pitiably deceived,

or else they deliberately and consciously set about to record a falsehood. The inevitable preference of judgment must be for the latter alternative, which, however, can be no more than a blasphemous excuse for what Dr. Faulkner describes as "the premature passion of a Galilean peasant."

How does this comport with the disposition sought to be made of the record of the Resurrection? The tomb of Joseph truly witnessed a resurrection; this is admitted on all sides; but it was not a bodily rising. What then inevitably follows here? Those who testified to the bodily Rising, and protested it to the limit of human speech, were themselves grossly deceived, or else perpetrated a gross deception on the ages of succeeding time. There can be no hesitancy in deciding which of these conclusions to accept.

At the risk of incidental repetitions, but to make the statement of the case perfectly clear, we may now summarize the points which are sought to be supported against the scriptural record of the Resurrection. This, as has already been indicated, will include none of the once prevalent literary and historical objections to the canonical record, these having ceased to be matters of controversy in the representative schools of criticism. The theory of tendential and emotional influences in creating the material of the New Testament stories of the Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection has some features that do not fall strictly under the head of historical and literary criticism; but they either answer themselves or are so improbable as to have no footing in a serious argument. The reasoning which criticism has used in support of these tendential and emotional influences would include every statement of the gospel relating to the divinity of the Son of Man. If a community of sentimental fondness and enthusiasm in the group of the early disciples accounts for the story of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, the same community sentiment can be made to account for the

Sermon on the Mount, the parables, the healing ministry, the Passion, and the Crucifixion. This would eliminate the Teacher and the Sacrifice, and make both the affectional and the ethical sides of the gospel the output of an enthusiasm which began without adequate reason or impulse. This would reduce the whole issue to the last limit of absurdity and destructivism. We may therefore feel justified in holding as comprehesive the following presentation of the case, so far as it appears an open contest.

1. One section of those who dissent from the doctrine of the bodily Resurrection assert that the body of the Crucified was secretly removed from the tomb of Joseph, and that it was so successfully deposited elsewhere that the fact never became known to any except those immediately responsible.

2. Another form of this dissent is that the Body did not come forth from the tomb at all; but that it there passed through the processes of natural decay. This, with the theory of secret removal, necessitates the further theory that the phenomenon of the Resurrection was something quite apart from, and independent of, the substance of the Galilean Body.

3. A third and rather recent-day contention seems to be that the Body, after serving in the tomb its uses of matrix for the "spiritual body," was dissolved into elemental gases and disappeared.

4. Closely allied to the above is the theory which, if a statement can be made of it at all, holds that, at the moment of the Resurrection, the Body became so etherealized that every essence and relation of corporeity disappeared; and that from being a body of flesh and bones it became pure spirit, or at least was transmuted into a constituency unknown to the categories of substance.

5. The resurrection of the Body is, the dissidents declare, from any viewpoint, a theory contrary to experience and the teachings of science.

6. The continued and enduring existence of a body of ponderable and tangible parts is unthinkable, and again contrary to the conclusions of science.

7. The objection claims to find in the analogy of the bodies of the redeemed an argument against the bodily rising of Jesus. St. Paul's teaching concerning the resurrection of "the dead in Christ" is here appealed to, on the ground, necessarily, that the spiritual bodies of the redeemed and the risen Body are to be thought of as coming through the same process. The contrary of this is to be shown in our argument. The one is cause; the other effect.

8. The opposition asserts that a bodily resurrection is incompatible with the higher spirituality of the gospel and of the Messianic kingdom to be established in the heavenly places.

9. A pitiable theory is that which supposes the Crucified to have revived after being placed in the sepulcher; and then as stealing past the soldiers to join his disciples in some such way as is sought to be described by the Evangelists. This theory probably has often been exploited during the Christian ages, and has had some modern advocates; but it is too inane to meet the tolerance of an infidel. The accusing and witnessing Jews, who saw him nailed, testified to the completeness of his physical dying: "That deceiver said, *while he was yet alive.*"

10. Yet again, and finally, the dissent claims that the bodily Resurrection cannot be proved from the Scriptures. This brings the issue to a focal.

In our answer to this series of contentions we shall deal first with the last statement of the summary—namely, that the bodily Resurrection is not provable from the Scriptures. It must be clear that if this contention is silenced the others can have no standing except upon grounds of speculative and unsupported opinion.

Our first concern will be with those eyewitnesses of the Resurrection whose testimony is recorded in the Gospels.

Transcendent as was the event, it yields to verification, argument, and the logic of fact. The very first witnesses of the bodily Rising were the members of the Roman guard who were set to watch the sepulcher whose door was sealed by the Roman authorities and forbidden by mandate of Pilate.

At the first token of the Rising, the guard which had kept watch at the sepulcher fled in terror from the place. As the record is read, this occurred but a brief while before the visit of the women, who found the sepulcher door unsealed and open, the stone of the inner vault rolled away, and the tomb itself empty. This undoubtedly is what the soldiers perceived in the moment before their flight; for it is recorded that they immediately reported "all the things that were done" (the things seen by the women) to the chief priests in the city. At first, their story was straightforward; but later, through fear and bribery, they were induced to support the story, manufactured by the priests, that the disciples of Jesus had come while they slept and borne his body away.

Let us consider the details of this story and the manner of its subsequent withdrawal. (a) It is clear that the guard testified to the fact of having seen the Body and of its departure from the miraculously opened sepulcher; else why the patched-up substitute, "His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept"? (b) It is also certain that they witnessed to the attendant signs of the Rising—the earthquake, the appalling brightness, and the appearance of the two superhuman beings amazingly clothed. (c) Nor is it less certain that they, at first, vindicated themselves by showing that they had kept a due and constant vigil up to the hour that closed the three days of their legal watch, so that no chance for the human invasion of the tomb had been possible. The women, indeed, had timed their visit to this hour of the expiring legal watch.

But as it rounded to its close, the miracle of the universe occurred.

It is not to be supposed that the Roman guards knew the reason for their watch, or knew anything beforehand of the possibility of the miracle which they witnessed. The Roman soldier was a military automaton. His superior said to him, "Go," and he went; he said, "Come," and he came. He asked no question and sought no reason. The Jerusalem garrison was probably made up from Parthian or Massagetæ contingents, and so less intelligent and interested than the native Roman legionary. The miracle of the Resurrection was not anticipated by even the chiefest of the apostles. They had indeed heard their Master's words, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again"; but they were words of mystery. The priests and scribes had heard the selfsame words; but they suggested only the possibility of a grave robbery or some such leached out *zauberei* as is imagined by the ultra modernist. They prepared only against a propagandist story; not against Omnipotence. The Resurrection was undreamed-of outside of the foreknowledge of God.

What then is the evidential value of the first report made by the Roman guard? It was the frank, sincere, and uncolluded statement of men concerning a fact about which they had had no previous bias or prejudice. They told what they saw, and their testimony agreed throughout. This must be accepted as the very highest character of evidence. No court of any jurisdiction would reject such testimony; from the viewpoint of simple jurisprudence, it presents no point of exception. The element of self-interest was entirely wanting. Had the guard gone about to invent a story, this had been the last resort; for the human unbelievableness of it exposed its tellers to the severest possible official inquiry. Nor had the soldiers time to concoct a story to their own advantage; their flight was precipitate and their report was immediately made. It must be ob-

served, too, that had their first story been grounded in any character of evasion or falsehood, each had varied from the other in some more or less important particular. This clearly was not the case; there was unanimity concerning "all the things that were done."

We have already noted that the changed report of the guards was due to fear and bribery. The extent to which fear influenced them to accept the false statement prepared for them is not set forth by the evangelist; but it is easy to see how they were affected by the argument of a bribe, with which every Roman of high or low degree was familiar. Thus were the soldiers silenced by the priests. If it became necessary, a still larger bribe could be laid in the hands of Pilate.

The suborned testimony of the Roman guard runs true to human nature; it also runs to an agreement with the general course of the events which attend the beginnings of the gospel. This general course of happenings exhibits conflicting forces; the emergence, in the midst of a divine program, of those elements and factors against which the gospel must contend until it issues in final and complete victory. A gospel record without the impinging of these happenings had been too ideal for the uses of faith and thought.

The testimony of the three women—the two Marys and Salome—who were early at the sepulcher on the morning of the third day, has supplied the second link in the proof of the bodily Rising. Almost equally with the Roman guard, they were unprepared for what met their eyes at the tomb. They had brought with them spices for the further embalming of the body of the Crucified; and, as noted, had timed their coming to the hour when the law should have withdrawn its watch, and when entrance into the sepulcher would be possible, barring the rolling away of the stone. There is no suggestion of reservation in the minds of these women; no glimmering token of a hope that the dead might

rise. The last tribute of love was to be paid; the Master was to be prepared for his long sleep, and the mourners were to go about the streets in sad memory of what had been hoped might come to Israel. When they arrived the Roman guard was gone; the tomb was empty; no human being, other than themselves, was near the place. It was indeed the beginning of verity; their knowledge of the Resurrection was to emerge in initial discovery and naked fact.

What was the order of their discovery? First, they perceived that the round stone closing the vault had been rolled aside. That, in itself, would have suggested to their minds a human invasion of the tomb; but instantly their gaze fell upon two beings whom they recognized as heavenly visitants, proclaiming the rolling away of the stone to have been a miracle. By the same unearthly sponsors they were informed that the Lord was risen, and were invited to view the place where the Body had lain but a brief while before. The angels then gave the women a message for the Eleven, directing them to go into Galilee, where they should see the Lord in his risen Body.

But a surer demonstration was to be given the women of the Rising. As they hurried to deliver the message to the Eleven, Jesus himself met them in the way, and greeted them with the familiar salutation, "All hail!" He was instantly recognized by his Galilean countrywomen, who approached him, held his feet, and worshiped him. The story of Mary Magdalene's separate meeting with Jesus is a detail of the general account, and probably comes of Mary's having preceded her two companions from the sepulcher, on learning that the Body was no longer there. She appears not to have fully comprehended the glorious fact announced by the angels. She, however, hurried to Peter and John and imparted to them the fact that the Body was no longer in the tomb. She then followed these two disciples back to the scene, where occurred the events

narrated in John xx. 11-17. It was after this that she reported to the Eleven that she had seen the Lord.

What bearing does the story of the women have on the question of the bodily Rising? The bearing is most direct. They recognized the features of the Risen One and fully identified them with those of the Galilean. His voice was familiar to their ears. They held his feet, in palpable and conscious contact with his flesh. In the separate interview with Mary Magdalene, his inhibition, "Touch me not," can only be interpreted as indicating that the more intimate acts of greeting which belonged to the Galilean days were at an end; but there was left the residual idea of a real body subject to touch. This is established beyond any manner of doubt.

The testimony of Peter and John, who ran to the sepulcher, following the tidings brought by the women, also contributes to place the case upon the highest planes of proof. Coming to the sepulcher, they found it empty. The linen clothes and the napkin, which had enswathed the body and face of the Crucified, they found disposed in such fashion as indicated the absence of haste or body-stealing. This at once appealed to the understanding and reason of each. Sixty years later, St. John minutely describes the facts in his Gospel.

St. Luke, who probably received confirmation of the fact from Peter himself, tells us that on the same day—that is, the day of the Resurrection—the Lord "appeared to Simon." This probably occurred immediately after the visit by Peter and John to the tomb. That he then identified the Body in the same manner as had the women is beyond the shadow of doubt. St. Paul (in 1 Corinthians xv. 5) gives this appearance first place in the transcendent proofs of the Resurrection.

The experience of the two disciples who, on the afternoon of the first Easter day, walked to the village of Emmaus supplies a corroborative and complementing testimo-

ny. In the way, while their thoughts dwelt on the mystery of the empty tomb, Jesus, for the time unrecognized, "drawing near, walked with them," and, in a not unnatural way, entered into their fellowship. Nothing in the fact or manner of his overtaking or falling in with them was out of the usual order of such journeyings in an Oriental roadway. So natural, in fact, was the bearing of Jesus that they took him to be a courteous peasant of the district. The value of the whole attitude of the story in this respect is large, and is probably the explanation of why the incident appears in the general narrative of the Resurrection. Had the risen Body been other than it was in the Galilean days, it had not produced so natural and unobtrusive an impression on their senses. The thought that their fellow traveler was a man like themselves prevented them from giving to his features a second glance; and the intensity of their processes was such that, although their hearts burned under his words, they looked steadily forward as they walked. All this tends to show that a divine movement in the gospel was to demonstrate that the post-Resurrection Body was one and the same with that which was nailed to the cross. This movement is evident in the further details of the Emmaus story.

Having been constrained by the two disciples to tarry with them, Jesus was made known in the breaking of bread. It was not a supernatural, nor even an unnatural, token that revealed him, but rather the most natural and familiar of all the Lord's manners or habits—the manner and habit of serving at table. It was in the *eulogia*, that daily thrice-repeated pause of reverence before the breaking of bread, that their eyes seized again the familiar features and identity of their Lord.

In his critical and exegetical notes on this passage, J. A. Spencer says, "It does not seem necessary to suppose anything miraculous in the fact or manner of the Lord's leaving the two disciples"; and this will occur to any careful

reader of the contexts. The force of the original is, "He was no longer seen of them"; which leaves it open to suppose him to have gone out in the same natural way in which he entered; and equally when, "drawing near, he walked with them."

In St. Luke's account of the first appearance of the Lord to the general body of the disciples (xxiv. 36), the evidence becomes specific as to fact and relation. And, first, when it was discovered of the company that he was in the midst, there was fear, even Peter, with the rest, supposing a spirit had entered; but Jesus, in the old accustomed way, calmed the general fear and said, in language which only can have been meant to meet a perpetually possible doubt concerning the bodily Resurrection: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Could language be more direct?

It will be observed that in the above-quoted words of our Lord two emphatic points are made: first, that he *was not a spirit;* that his body was not imponderable, nor, from the standpoint of sense, unreal; second, that he possessed, as before his death, "*flesh and bones.*" The final test of reality was then offered in the invitation, "Handle me, and see"—be convinced beyond any peradventure "that it is I myself."

St. John, in his Gospel, makes corroborative record of this interview, while in his first Epistle the memory of it expands into the profoundest philosophy of the Evangel: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life."

The contention which would explain the Resurrection in the terms of a specious spiritism will, however, insist that the phrase, "the doors were shut," is fatal to the doctrine of the reality of the Body. This arises from the superficial construing of the language. Whether "the doors" were of

an inner or an outer portal does not matter; in any case there would have been a keeper to give necessary notice of the approach of a band or compact of conspiracy. A single Galilean peasant, even if not fully identified, would scarcely have been challenged. The possible number of disciples in Jerusalem, even at this time, ran well beyond one hundred. Besides, Jesus might well have entered with the first groups of those who came, and so not have been recognized until he made the commanding gesture so well understood by all. However, we could not have the slightest difficulty in accepting the entrance as miraculous. The power which transfigured the Body on Greater Hermon, which sent forth healing virtue to the lazars of Galilee, and that wrought in the tomb the miracle of the Resurrection, was not circumscribed in its movements by locked gates and closed doors. The ancient processional has application: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in!" The weakness of criticism lies largely in the fact that it is forced to imagine difficulties where difficulties do not exist, and to force its arguments beyond the bounds of reasonable construction.

That the ultimate of the fact of his bodily identity might be established in perpetual record, Jesus completed before his disciples the proof by calling for food and eating in their presence "a piece of broiled fish, and of an honeycomb." There was no illusion; the physical proof was complete.

The interview with Thomas in the presence of the others, which occurred on the eighth day after the first showing, reëxhibits the proofs of the first, giving them a so intensified personal relation as to fix a perpetual precedent for the correction of personal doubt. Likewise, the showing which occurred by the shores of the Sea of Tiberias drew the trend of reality through the courses of personal affection and loyalty.

It is in connection with the claim of a bodily Resur-

rection—the rising of the Christ who "died" and was "buried"—that St. Paul affirms he was "seen of above five hundred brethren at one time." This occurred during the Forty Days, and, no doubt, in Galilee, where the number of disciples was greatest. There is no Synoptical or Johannine account of this event, as there is none of the appearance to James; but there is no occasion for supposing that the Body was less evidently present than on the occasions of which we have detailed reports.

It is logical now to ask what foretokens of the bodily Resurrection are found in the Old Testament. The prophecies show a constant knowledge of the Sacrifice, and the Messianic predictions lead to the portals of a grave; but it is seldom that the veil is parted. However, the spirit of prophecy and the letter of fulfillment meet in Simon Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, when he boldly appropriated for his Master the Davidic utterance: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." However incomplete may have been the Davidic foresight, the Davidic prophecy, "Thou wilt not suffer thine Holy One *to see corruption*," completely anticipates the bodily Resurrection.

In Job, Isaiah, and Daniel are particularly to be noted utterances which not only indicate expectation of a resurrection of the dead, but also, though in no fullness of expression, imply the participation of the body. Industrious effort has been made to neutralize the words of Job: "Though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." But whatever critical finesse may be brought to bear on the text and the relation, the words make unison with the volume of which they are a part. Nor less can be said of similar and approximate expressions in Isaiah, Daniel, and other prophecies.

We have assessed the testimony of St. Paul in his epistles to the bodily Resurrection in a single, but decisive, citation. The other New Testament epistles, the Acts, and

the Apocalypse are not less in harmony with the four Gospels. But the mightiest contribution to the record of the Rising, as also the most direct as to its reality, are the words of the Christ himself: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." "He spake of the temple of his body." Let the emphasis be put where it belongs—"*He spake of the temple of his Body.*" It was the Body that rose.

Thus we have traversed the last of the critical objections appearing in our summary. It now remains to bring to bear whatever arguments may not already have been set against the other objections enumerated.

1. It must be admitted that the most logical of all the diversions against the doctrine of the bodily Rising is the choice of one or the other of the theories of body-stealing or of the dead having been left in the sepulcher through oversight or hallucination. In either case, "corruption" and natural decay must needs have resulted. To that end, the post-Resurrection manifestations of the New Testament must be ignored or "gazed out of countenance." The difficulty is not only the tremendous spiritual argument against it, but the absence of any supporting fact, either within or without the record. The members of the Roman guard bore a competent and conclusive testimony in their first report: but when amended to a charge of body-snatching against the disciples of the Crucified, it is completely ruled out of court. No critic would dare adopt it as a basis of argument; no lawyer would on it take a brief for the Roman guard. Either would as readily avow as his own the character and act of Judas Iscariot; and yet criticism, in the last analysis, is driven to this, or to an even less definite and reliable alternative. It is an equation rigid throughout and closed at both ends.

As we have before observed, the acceptance of any theory of the natural decay of the Body completely separates the Resurrection from any relation to that body. It

would not then have been the *dead* who arose, but the *always living* Christ; a contradiction not only of terms, but of whatsoever therein bears the semblance of an idea. This result cannot be denied, however subtly the case be argued. The significance and value of the Resurrection are thereby reduced to zero.

2. The hypothesis which supposes the body of the Crucified to have dissolved into its constituent gases, after having served as a "matrix" for the "spiritual body," while seriously put forward, has not been stated or held in form; and yet it must inevitably become the refuge of that argumentation which contends for a rising in which the human body of Christ had no part. The merging of this hypothesis into another, which supposes the disappearance of the human body of Christ through an etherealizing process, at the moment of the Resurrection, does not help, but further complicates the case. Both views are obnoxious to reputable science, as well as being contradictory of the letter of revelation; and yet somewhere amongst these discordances the objection to the bodily Resurrection must write its creed, when once it has been forced to a formal confession.

3. The contention that the rising and living again of a body once dead is contrary to the teaching and data of science is simply to say that science knows of no such reanimation, and that it has not extended its categories to the realm in which such realizations may become of record. The possibilities of this realm have not been dreamed of. The fixing of the limits of science is arbitrary. Philosophy has arbitrarily divorced psychology from its contents, thereby closing the gate to an advance into the higher spiritual perceptions. Psychology has, for its own part, defined itself as the science of brain phenomena. As the case now stands, *Resurrection* is not a contradiction of science, but is simply unknown to its present self-restricted sphere. This does not argue that such knowledge is for-

ever impossible: Science is not a forever doomed underling, but is only in the nonage of its being.

The assumed scientific impossibility of the perpetual existence of a body spiritually raised from the dead is not a new difficulty, but a new aspect of the old. The final science of the Resurrection is found in the effect of spirit on matter and not matter on spirit. The miracle which was wrought in the Galilean Body from the hour of the Bethlehem Birth to the hour of the Resurrection is the epitome of what has been wrought, what is being wrought, and what is yet to be wrought, in the body of the race throughout the ages of the regeneration. When the Resurrection cycles shall have culminated in a redeemed and perfected race, then will the bodies of the redeemed have advanced to the estate of the Body that lived and moved in Galilee. The time has not yet come in which the mind of man can cover this thought in a completed science or philosophy. Such knowledge is itself a stage of the Resurrection cycle.

4. Confusion has come to both faith and criticism in identifying the "spiritual body" of the human resurrection with that of the risen Body of the Crucified. This is done despite the exhibition of a multitude of opposites. The whole question of sin and racial depravity lies between; and it is not the theology, but the fact, that concerns the argument. The bodies of men are integrated from and through their essential human nature. What is beyond this is of grace and spiritual invasion. Therefore, by the tokens of nature, the human body is carnal, sold under sin; it is not spiritual, "neither indeed can be." It can only be made spiritual through the processes of grace which have their culmination in a human bodily resurrection, the culminating point of redemptive completeness. "And not only they, but we ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within our-

selves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our bodies.*"

The Body of Jesus was integrated from and through his divine-human nature. By this token, the Body was always and essentially spiritual, divine, in the sense of being holy from the moment of its conception, and in every point and particular of its constitution. It is grace that makes the human body perfect and brings to it the power of the Resurrection, thus replacing the nature which begat it. But the Nature which integrated the Galilean Body was itself Grace, Redemption, and Resurrection. No change, except that which answered to the divine Fullness templed within, was needed by, or came to, the Body in life, in rising, or in ascension. That body of humanity which, being "sown a natural body," is to be raised "a spiritual body," becomes, in its highest perfection, what the Body was, in the Transfiguration, walking on the sea, and miracle-clothed amid the scenes of healing in Galilee. Only this view comports with the words of Scripture or what bearing the accumulated data of science have on the Resurrection.

5. That the fact of the bodily Resurrection should be inimical to the ideal of the Messianic kingdom, is to change the whole prophecy and aspect of that kingdom and to throw it into a chaos of new and unthinkable relations.

Much stress is laid by the critics on the saying of St. Paul: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." The exclusion is held by some to be decisive against the doctrine of bodily resurrection. But both a definition of terms and a study of connections are necessary before a final judgment may be passed. The words of the apostle are imbedded in a discourse whose theme is the resurrection of the body. "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" Then is asked a question of universal interest: "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" (1 Cor. xv. 35.)

The crux of this inquiry concerns the *body*. Without it, a resurrection would be meaningless. What kind of body, then? The answer is forthcoming. This body—the spiritual or resurrection body—is likened to a grain of wheat which has come forth of another grain, of wheat of exactly its kind, which has suffered corruption in the ground; it is the same nature and substance of body, minus the corruption of decay. The resurrection body is the same as the pre-resurrection body, minus the corruption of sin and death. God giveth according to his pleasure, "but to every seed his own body."

The argument holds throughout that the body is raised. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. . . . It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The emphatic and determinative *speiretai*, "It is sown," identifies the two bodies, as to fact and essence. The kernels of the two grains of wheat remain the same in kind and substance. If the wheat grain could be thought of as having succession in a barley grain, then both the simile and the law must fail. In the same way, the body is involved in the law of life. The law is perpetual; so also is the identity of the body. The body may change, in either the order of advance or deterioration, but it can never lose identity nor the periphery of its nature. The miracle of transition from corruption delivers the wheat grain into its wholeness; the miracle of the resurrection delivers the bodies of the redeemed from the corruption of sin and the grave into the final and eternal state.

It is now in order to inquire into the significance of the phrase "flesh and blood," as describing exclusion from the kingdom of God, to see if that exclusion reaches to the body in its proper and essential constitution. It will hardly be denied that the phrase "flesh and blood" is here used for the elliptical "flesh," so variously employed by St. Paul and the other New Testament writers. This

then is the word we must seek to relate in the present connection. In doing so, we have as our objective to determine in what sense the flesh is shut out from the kingdom of God. The Scriptures distinguish the following different meanings of the word *flesh* (Greek, *sarx;* Hebrew, *basar*):

(1) The matter constituting animal bodies. "And he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof." (Gen. ii. 21.) This use is irrelevant to our inquiry, and therefore may be passed by.

(2) The life of men in ordinary relations; relations that naturally cease with death. "This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth." (Gen. ix. 17.) This is the mundane relation of flesh—all flesh; the balance between the race and the laws of nature and providence. This is the condition of humanity approached by the gospel, and to which the invitation and promises of the gospel are addressed. In a general sense, it is what we call civilization.

(3) Kinship, the marital state, and relations of consanguinity. "He is our brother and our flesh." (Gen. xxxvii. 27.) "And shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." (Gen. ii. 24.) The Scriptures plainly declare that these relations are sublunary; that they cease with this life: that in heaven all are "as the angels of God"; that "in the resurrection there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage."

(4) The altruistic state. "And that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh." (Isa. lviii. 7.) This is indeed a means of making the rule of the kingdom effective. It is not inimical to the life beyond the resurrection, but is more particularly expositive of the life that now is. How far the spiritual and brotherly habitudes of this life may be perpetuated in the eternal intercourse and fellowships may well be a subject of devout meditation. It may also extend its suggestions to the question of "with what body" the righteous dead shall "come."

(5) The helplessness of mankind in general; racial weakness, both physical and moral. "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm." (Jer. xvii. 5.) This is the state in which the whole human family is exposed to temptation and suffering. It is from this bondage of nature that the redeemed are translated into "the kingdom of God's dear Son." It not only exhibits the background and the embodiment of the need which the gospel meets, but it furnishes the all-illuminating contrast between the surroundings of the natural body and the spiritual body.

(6) The present life of individual men; in a way, those opportunities, privileges, and obligations which mark the tasks of individual people, particularly of Christians. "To abide in the flesh is more needful for you." (St. Paul.) Though this has no theological bearing on the matter at issue, it may suggest that, as the great and world-influencing ministry of St. Paul was conducted from convictions which came from and were impelled by forces which dwelt within that concept of himself which he here calls the "flesh," so the career which he so clearly sighted for himself in "the heavenly places" must well befit that flesh when quickened and glorified with the Lord.

(7) The course of nature, in birth and continued human existence; the details of transitory life. This includes the idea of procreation, maternity, and the family on the conventional and secular side. As in other connections, it does not imply lawlessness or the guilt of actual transgression; but it does include the element of moral ignorance and those motions that are of sense and appetency. "For he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh." (Gal. iv. 23.) In contrasting the births of Ishmael and Isaac, there is seen a distinct bearing upon the two states of the flesh—the pre-resurrection and the post-resurrection states. So far as law and the human relation are concerned, the birth of Ishmael was not different from that of Isaac,

but the birth of Isaac was impinged upon by promise and miracle The spiritual body of the resurrecton is the body of promise and miracle.

(8) Whatever is considered excellent, aside from grace, as "nobility, wisdom, and understanding, or reason." "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh." (John i. 13.) That the human intellect will remain unimpaired, nay, will be greatly and eternally enlarged, in the life beyond the resurrection, is the certain and steadfast hope of believers. That personal qualities and attainments, such as have resulted from obedience to the truth and the operations of grace, will go unimpaired with the redeemed into the future life is no more to be doubted than is the fact of their present existence. In this respect the righteous may well hope that "in his flesh he shall see God."

(9) Works of personal righteousness and formality in religion, as ceremonies, rites, and ordinances. "But they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh." (Gal. vi. 13.) This especially typed the religious state of the temple Jews at Jerusalem. Their chief aim was to "make a fair show in the flesh." It was religious pride, the deadliest aspect of all the vices of pride, waxing into arrogance and intolerance, which at last became violence and murder. Concerning this pride of self-righteousness, Jesus said, rebuking the Jews: "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me: and where I am, thither ye cannot come." This is exclusion from the kingdom. This is that "pride of the eye and lust of life which is not of the Father."

(10) "The quality of corruption which is not sinful, but which is the effect of sin" (Cruden); the "engendered" corruption, whereof all are partakers. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee." (Matt. xvi. 17.) From these engendered weaknesses and infirmities there is constant deliverance through grace, even this side the resur-

rection. Beyond a doubt, so it seems to us, the words of St. Paul, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," come in here, relating to this confused, imperfect, and undelivered state of humanity. In apposition to it is the Master's unchanging formula, "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

(11) The corrupt and sinful nature of men before regeneration and sanctification of soul and body, whether considered as completed in this life or the resurrection. "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Rom. viii. 7, 8.) The meaning of *flesh* in this passage is unmistakable, but it is made doubly clear in the verse which immediately follows: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." From this it appears that it is the corrupt and sinful nature of man, and not his body, as such, that is excluded from the kingdom of Messiah. What we have developed in this inquiry leads us to conclude that the body is, equally with the spirit, involved in all the promises and actualities of redemption; that the resurrection is specifically the means and the occasion of the restoration and enthroning of the body. Something indeed of the glorious possibility of this seems to be foreshadowed in the words of our Lord in Luke xxii. 30: "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This would seem to be a special promise to chosen apostles; but in Revelation iii. 21 the promise is extended to all the redeemed: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne."

In the light of this catena of interpreted Scriptures, the passage, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," must mean the lack of power in man's natural constitution to attain to the divine life, either here or hereafter; and this is the plain significance of *ou dunantai*,

"cannot," in the original. It is again as the Master said to the Jews, "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me." It is the calamity which comes upon unregenerated flesh.

So much in answer to the objection that a bodily resurrection of the redeemed is repugnant to the ideal of the kingdom of Messiah. Does this objection go to the extent of affirming that the Body itself, the type and the cause of the resurrection, has not place in that kingdom? By no manner of construction can less than this be inferred. The Galilean left his body either to the "lorn Syrian hills," or else to a mystery which no human thought can compass. But what does the Christ himself say, and what do the Scriptures show? In Matthew xxiv. 30, the Lord utters this prophecy concerning himself: "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." The character of this manifestation is further described in Revelation i. 7: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him."

This is to be the formal inauguration of the last stage of the Messianic reign. It is fitly marked by the personal and bodily advance of the King. Under the clothing of his glorious triumph his Galilean identity is not lost; even *those who pierced him* will see and recognize him as the Crucified. It is nothing to the point to object that this language is apocalyptic. We have yet to learn that those things which have hitherto been discounted or passed by as apocalyptic are the most real of all. The cheapest behavior of which criticism has ever been guilty is its contumelious treatment of the apocalyptic sections of the Hebrew prophecies.

St. Paul, in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, sees a bodily descent of Christ in the day of the restoration of the kingdom: "For the Lord himself shall descend with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." It is at this time that the bodies of the redeemed, rising first,

shall mount up "in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air." This passage is also apocalyptic in essence, but is none the worse therefor. It, however, has the distinct quality of being epistolary, and of having been delivered in the ordinary course of giving comfort in pastoral ministry. Its letter is as sincere and direct as is its spirit. Both are free from mysticism.

St. John in the opening paragraphs of the Apocalypse sets forth not only a lofty ideal of the relation of Jesus Christ to the Church; but he there also sketches an eternity-challenging portrait of the bodily revealed Son of Man. The resplendence of his glory and the color circumstance of the stars, the candlesticks, and the two-edged sword had blinded even the perception of faith except for the mystery-riving words: "I am he that was dead, and, behold, I am alive forevermore." What was dead but the Body, which had moved through Galilee its appointed years? And what was now forever become alive, the center of authority in the Messianic kingdom, but the Body, transfigured in Hermon, pierced on Calvary, and raised from Joseph's tomb? This is the Apocalyptic finality.

This brings us, not without logical fitness, to consider the Master's own statement of the grounds of belief in the resurrection of the just. To the Jews who had raised a sinister question touching the resurrection he said: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." The doctrine is based on the law of life, that law of which we have already spoken. That life is in God; it *is* God, who imparts that life to men that in them he may be forever glorified. The plans and administration of Jehovah do not have to do with life that is limited by time or opportunities of growth; the covenant is eternal. So also is the unity of life eternal. The body of humanity represents

something eternal in the consciousness of Deity. That consciousness is fully expressed in the Galilean Body. As the Christ had power to lay down his body and to take it up again, so has he given to his saints to receive again the bodies wrested from them by death. The Messianic kingdom climaxes in this power.

It is to be noted also that Jesus puts himself in a direct and personal attitude toward the resurrection, and in that office utters a formula which can bear no other construction than that of bodily rising. "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." (John v. 28.) The visualizing of *the grave* is determinative; nor is the word (*mnemeiosis*) in the least degree shadowy or symbolic. Without the tomb of Joseph, the Resurrection had had no center and memorial; the graves of the righteous dead, whatever their condition or character, are to be accounted for in the general restoration. Till heaven and earth pass away, the tomb of Joseph is pledge.

. . . . . .

It is of both curious and instructive interest to note that the present-day denial of the bodily Resurrection is a recrudescence of the earliest of the great heresies of Christianity. Gnosticism and Docetism, and more particularly the latter, type this modern aberration. Due to the specious idealism of ancient philosophy, and the mysticism of the schools of Alexandria and Syria, early Christian thought was impinged upon by an intellectual syncretism. Hellenism was protean in form and insistent in spirit. Then, as now, those who were not strongly anchored to the apostolic faith were led astray by one or another of the numerous forms of so-called "knowledge." This use of the word "knowledge" makes a strange unison with the equally specious use of the word "science" by a cultic vagary of to-day. All started as a stumbling at the simplicity of the gospel; and all agree, in one way or another, in

opposition to the doctrine of the human personality of our Lord, the reality of his body, and the fact of his bodily Rising.

The beginning of heresy was prompted through the arrogation of superior knowledge and the general pride of intellect. The Pauline *gnosis* describes a Spirit-helped apprehension of the truth of the doctrines and precepts of the gospel. The office of this knowledge was perverted through arrogant ignorance and the clumsily appropriated results of science. Men mixed the extremes of religion and philosophy, and sought to amalgamate the most contradictory conclusions of both. The result was a grotesque absurdity, a something that was never dreamed of in the world before—Gnosticism, a debasement of the fundamental truths of revelation, and the creation of a set of substitutes so chimerical as to produce in the modern mind a sense of mingled pity and amazement.

A calm review of some present aspects of modernism will, however, force the conviction that the ancient situation is largely reproduced, especially with reference to the matters now under discussion. An obsession of feebly invoked science, a pervasion of intellectual pride, and, often, the attempt to satisfy a neglected conscience, describe the propulsive of a sadly augmenting section of the evangelical Church of to-day. The Christian Science aberration answers for the recrudescent hysteria of the Docetic side of the early heresy; whilst the radical modernists of the evangelical Church become sponsors for that recurrent Gnosticism which makes impossible the divinity of our Lord, by denying to his Body paternity in the Holy Ghost, and by turning the Resurrection into a phantasmal impression produced on the mind of the disciples; an idealism reduced to the point of shadow and air.

The ethic of the intellectualism above described is, as we must sadly think, too fully voiced in the strophe of a poet of the nineteenth century, Arthur Hugh Clough:

"Through the great sinful streets of Naples as I passed
With fiercer heat than flamed above my head,
My heart was hot within me; till at last
My brain was lightened when my tongue had said—
Christ is not risen!

Christ is not risen, no—
He lies and molders low;
Christ is not risen!"

It is only to add bitterness to sadness to think that this present-day intellectualism—Why not call it by its other name, rationalism?—must inevitably lead to an acceptance of the boldest tenet of the poet's Christless creed:

"And oh, good men of ages yet to be,
Who shall believe because ye did not see,
Oh, be ye warned, be wise!
No more with pleading eyes,
And sobs of strong desire,
Unto the empty, vacant void aspire,
Seeking another and impossible birth
That is not of your own, and only mother earth.
But if there is no other life for you,
Sit down and be content, since this must even do;
He is not risen!"

Who can foretell what must be the consequences to the life and ministry of religion, should the tide of this destructive reaction not be arrested? But it will be arrested. The Evangel has power in itself not only to maintain its own course, but to correct the pride, the errors, and the aberrations of men. A great and dynamical visitation is due to come to the Church and the world. It will strike not only along the levels of men's emotions and consciences; but, like sheets of summer lightnings, it will clarify the loftiest altitudes of the world's intellectualism. Forever the watchword of ongoing in faith and thought must be: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection."

1422.

DATE DUE

BS
540
.A35

34209

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS540.A35
The Aftermath series :
3 0645 0005 4454 0